LIBRARY
OF THE
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
AT
PRINCETON, N. J.

DONATION OF
SAMUEL AGNEW,
OF PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Letter ..... May 22d 1861,
No. 61-1

Case, Division SCC
Shelf, Section 2412
Book, No.

METHODISM AND THE CHURCH

OPPOSED IN

FUNDAMENTALS:

A LETTER

TO THE

REV. J. P. DURBIN, D. D.

PRESIDENT OF DICKINSON COLLEGE.

BY THE REV. WM. HERBERT NORRIS,

RECTOR OF ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, CARLISLE, PA.

J. M. KNEEDLER & Co., CARLISLE, PA.

1844.

PHILADELPHIA:

KING AND BAIRD, PRINTERS.

"The Scriptures and the Creed are not two different Rules of Faith, but one and the same Rule, dilated in Scripture, contracted in the Creed." —Archbishop Bramhall.

"The Apostles' Creed, the Nicene, with the additions of Constantinople and that which is commonly called the Symbol of S. Athanasius; and the four first General Councils are so entirely admitted by us, that they, together with the plain words of Scripture, are made the *Rule* and Measure of judging heresies among us."—Bishop Jeremy Taylor.

"We differ, then, from the Romanist in this, not in denying that Tradition is valuable, but in maintaining that by itself, and without scripture warrant, it does not convey to us any article necessary to salvation; in other words, that it is not a rule distinct and co-ordinate, but subordinate and ministrative.—Rev. J. H. Newman.

"What meanest thou by this word Sacrament?

Ans. I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us; ordained by Christ Himself *as a means whereby we receive the same*, and a pledge to assure us thereof."

How many parts are there *in* a Sacrament?

Ans. *Two*; the outward visible sign, *and* the inward Spiritual Grace.

What is the inward and Spiritual grace? ("*in Baptism.*")

Ans. A death unto Sin and a new birth *unto righteousness*; for being by nature born in Sin, and the children of wrath, we are *hereby* made the children of grace.

"OF THE LORD'S SUPPER."

What is the inward part or thing signified?

Ans. The Body and Blood of Christ which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful *in* the Lord's Supper.—CHURCH CATECHISM.

"He hath given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ *not only* to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that Holy Sacrament."—LITURGY.

Reverend Sir;

Inasmuch as you have hazarded a public discourse on matters that intimately concern the Church which I serve, you can not be surprised, if some of your reported statements should meet with severe criticism, and others with a pointed denial.

I, of course, was not present when you delivered the aforesaid discourse, and therefore it would be unfair for me to hold you responsible for the use of any particular words; but since you have given currency to several very erroneous opinions, for which you are referred to as authority, it becomes my painful duty to correct those opinions by publicly addressing you.

Your discourse seems to have been on what you and the "religious public" are pleased to style "Puseyism." The points you raised for discussion were "the Rule of Faith," "Justification," and "the doctrine of the Eucharist." Every body concurs in the belief, that you maintained that the teaching of many distinguished divines of the Church of England on these several points was in the main conformable to that which obtains in the Roman Church; and as such, opposed to the theological system authoritatively exhibited in the standards of the Anglican Communion in England and America; and again that you

took occasion to avow the identity of the Methodist view on those important points, with that of the Anglican system.

For the present I shall overlook the very common mistake, which ascribes to certain theologians of the University of Oxford a peculiar property in, and responsibility for, principles whose maintenance has earned for them a name 'which the world will not willingly let die;' neither do I conceive it worth my while to reply to the stale charge, that those principles are Roman rather than Anglican; nor to show under what qualifications they may be truly said to be common to both communions. If they are Anglican, it is quite gratuitous to inquire whether they are Roman or not. Herein does not exist the grievous accusation which I am about to repel. My ears have grown used to the clamor about "Puseyism" and "Popery;" and as the inhabitants of Niagara can sleep all undisturbed by the ceaseless and deafening roar of the cataract, so has it come to pass, that the noise which now fills the world about "Popery" in the Church of England, does not particularly arrest the attention of those who know how much it amounts to. But that Methodism should be identified with the Anglican theology on the several points, 'the Rule of Faith,' 'the means of Justification,' and 'the doctrine of the Eucharist,' is to me, certainly, a new thing. I have felt myself, Rev. Sir, obliged to deny that there is any truth in this opinion; and you will bear with me while I state the grounds of my denial.

These shall be, generally, *the alterations* which Methodists have felt themselves obliged to make in

our standards in order to render them capable of use, and consistent with their principles.

I. You read our VI. Article so as to make it exclude the authority and tradition of the Church Catholic from having any interference in the Church's Rule of Faith for individuals. In the first place, I deny that the article makes any such exclusion; for itself appeals to tradition, to support its own decision as to the character of the Apocryphal, or, as some Roman theologians call them, the deutero-canonical Books. These the Church appoints to be "read for example of life and instruction in manners, but doth not apply them to establish any doctrine;" thus making them a rule of moral practice, but not a rule of faith. This portion of our article, however, you have consistently expunged. Secondly, the XX. Article declares that "the Church *hath authority* in controversies *of faith*," and presupposes her paramount right to "expound" Scripture, of which she is the "witness and keeper," by saying that she "ought not to *decree* any thing against the same, nor besides the same, *to enforce* any thing to *be believed* for necessity of salvation." The whole of this Article also, the Methodists, from the necessities of their condition, have rejected. But again, to show that no such straitened sense can be put upon our VI. Article as would express your view of the Rule of Faith, I refer you to a canon of the Synod which in 1571, imposed subscription to the XXXIX. Articles. It is an authoritative decree of the Church, quite as much so as the VI. Article itself. Its drift is the same; it uses similar language; it is an executive sentence

carrying out the injunction of the Articles; it is a rule by which the Clergy are to be guided in teaching and in exacting submission to the faith. I commend it to your candid consideration: "The preachers shall in the first place be careful never to preach any thing to be religiously held and believed by the people, but what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and collected from that very doctrine *by the Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops.*" Be pleased, Rev. Sir, to pause over these words, for a moment. Observe that they are not the words of any particular man or party of men. *They are a decree of the Church;* they show in the Church's own words what is the Church's Rule of Faith. They prove beyond possibility of cavil, that the rule of Scriptural interpretation by which the Clergy are to be guided is not their own private judgment; because, even though they should think any doctrine to be Scriptural, still they are charged to be careful not to preach it except it be also collected out of the Scripture "by the Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops." So that by the decision of the Church, Scripture interpreted by the Church and not by particular individuals, is her Rule of Faith. The instrument of interpretation is the Catholic Faith, or that integral body of dogmatic teaching which has been believed in the Church "always, every where, and by all;" the witnesses to the existence of such a faith, as having been handed down from age to age, are the great Doctors and Bishops of each particular age, whom the Church recognised as her teachers; the law interpreted, is the written word of God;

the office of private judgment is to recognise this divine teaching, to distinguish it from all peculiar opinions, individual interpretations of Scripture, and sectarian doctrines, and to submit to it, because in every age it has been declared to be the word of God, by "the Church of the Living God, which is the pillar and ground of the Truth." Hence opinions and private interpretations of Scripture which may have been current in some portion or portions of the Church and not in others, or in some age or ages and not in all from the beginning, are by the Anglican Rule, necessarily excluded from the Catholic Faith, even though they may have been here and there imposed, or held as of faith, e. g. such doctrines as the Pope's Sovereignty, transubstantiation, the worship of the Blessed Virgin, and purgatorial satisfaction to God's justice, with the concomitant abuse of purgatorial pardons, or, as they are now called, "indulgences."* In like manner and *a fortiori* that rule excludes from the teaching of our Church all doctrines whatsoever that had their origin in the ecclesiastical convulsions of the sixteenth century, and all developements of those doctrines.

You must therefore perceive, Rev. Sir, that obedience on the part of Anglican divines, to the canon of their Church, is not to act inconsistently with the VI. Article. A recognition of the "authority of the Church in controversies of faith," submission to what she "enforces to be believed" as scriptural truth, (Art. XX.) preaching only what the Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops have collected out of Scripture, does

* See Note A. at the end.

not deny, but rather maintains, that "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation, so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man that it should be believed as *an article of faith*, or be thought requisite or *necessary to salvation*." No Anglican divines of any note (none whatever that I have heard of) have written a word in disparagement of this principle of the Church. The doctrinal and practical teaching of them all is in strictest accordance with it; and as to those called 'Oxford Divines,' no writers of the day are more remarkable for confidence in appealing to Holy Writ for authority, ample authority, on every point which they propose as of faith. Mr. Newman has published six volumes of sermons on almost all subjects; and if they may be said to be distinguished for any one thing more than another, it is for the profusion of Scripture texts which he interweaves in them, and by them proving and illustrating every important statement that he makes. It may be safely said that the English language contains no sermons that approach his in that paramount quality. Your citations, therefore, from the writings of those divines on the Rule of Faith, by no means serve your purpose. Their words are to be interpreted according to the principles of their own Church, and not by the principles of Methodism. They uphold the tradition of the Church, just as our great divines have always done, not as if the Scriptures did not contain the whole Christian faith, but, as being the true antagonist to self-will, capricious belief, and heretical interpretations of

Scripture. A church claiming "authority in controversies of faith" must of necessity have an authoritative traditional faith. Were it otherwise, the Church of England would stultify herself in putting forth any such claim as that in her XX. Article. Methodism has rejected that article, and therefore is wise in making no appeals to tradition; but let it not be supposed that what would be inconsistent and absurd in Methodism is inconsistent in the Church of England, or in an Anglican divine. On the contrary what the former cannot do, the latter must do. Our VI. Article therefore, Rev. Sir, in the Anglican system means one thing; that portion of it which you have appropriated, means with you quite another. If you are satisfied with your own, be it so; but I beg you will not again think of ascribing your principles to our Church. It cannot be done truthfully; it cannot be done without imposing on the ignorance and credulity of those who are unable to examine the subject for themselves.

II. I proceed now to notice your assumed alliance of Methodism with the Anglican system, in their respective views on 'the means of Justification' and on 'the Sacraments,' particularly 'the Eucharist.' These were I believe distinct topics in your discourse, but I must consider them together. You were able to distinguish them; I, in the present instance, cannot. I am to show that there is no such similarity in our doctrine on the above mentioned points as you have pleased yourself withal; but rather a complete antagonism. The basis of my argument will be the same as heretofore, viz. the avowed departure of Methodism from

the faith of our church as witnessed by the alterations which they have made in our formularies.

In the first place I call your attention to the fact that you have taken our XVI. Article, "Of sin after Baptism," and after making one or two significant alterations, have entitled it "Of Sin after *Justification;*" thus bearing witness that the XXXIX. Articles do make Baptism a means of Justification, and that Methodism does not; proving that Justification in the theology of the Articles means one thing, and with the Methodists quite another. The great principle on which our XVI. Article is based, is that of Spiritual Regeneration in Baptism. It asserts that fundamental article* of the Catholic Faith in the plainest language, e. g. "*after we have received the Holy Ghost* we may depart from grace given and *fall into sin.*" But Methodism rejects the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, and hence cannot appropriate to itself our XVI. Article without altering it so as to make it conformable to *their* doctrine of Justification; which it is maintained is immediate on simple faith, i. e. without any intervention of sacraments as means of conferring that grace.

Theologians, Rev. Sir, will see at once, that here a great *principle* divides us; a principle which is cardinal, and which in fact contains the *gist* of the whole controversy. Adopt the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, and in the minds of consistent persons, the whole Catholic System which ignorance miscalls "Puseyism," follows as a matter of course; and as

* "I acknowledege One Baptism *for the remission of sins.*" *Nicene Creed.*

necessarily will the Lutheran dogma of Justification and the systems which are built thereon, be rejected as involving heresy. Consistency between any other real or imaginable contradictions might be supposed just as easily as between the system of the Church, and that of Methodism, or any other phase of Lutheranism. This, Rev. Sir, you will not only admit, but rather maintain. A system which upholds sacramental media of Justification, and one that denies all *such* media are of course heterogeneous to each other. That which you adopt is of the latter character, that of the Anglican Church, or rather of the church catholic in all ages, is the former. Now if this fundamental difference between us is not sufficiently obvious to you from the consistent and necessary treatment which our XVI. Article received from the founders of your society, I can show the same as fully from other parts of our formularies.

I call your attention then in the second place to the meaning of our XI. Articles "Of the Justification of man." This Article confesses itself to be an incomplete statement of the whole doctrine. It raises but one point, viz. the ground or procuring cause *(propter quod)* of man's justification, i. e. the merits of Christ in contrast with our own works or deserving; and then concisely states faith to be the sole grace, the sole means which qualifies us for a participation of the merits of our Lord. And then, after declaring this Justification by faith only to be "most wholesome and comfortable," it refers us to the Homily where the doctrine is "more largely expressed." That Homily professes to deliver the doctrine as it was

always received by the Fathers and Doctors of the Church Catholic. Its words are, "and *after this manner*, to be justified only by this true and lively faith speak *all* the old and ancient authors both Greeks and Latins." Then it quotes directly from St. Hilary, St. Basil, and St. Ambrose, and refers for like testimony to Origen, St. Chrysostom, St. Cyprian, St. Augustine, Prosper, Œcumenius, Phocius, Bernardus and Anselm, thus appealing to the teaching of the great Doctors of the Church down to the eleventh century. After this the Homily proceeds immediately: "Nevertheless this sentence, that we be justified by faith only is not meant of them (i. e. the Fathers,) that the said justifying faith *is alone* in man without true repentance, hope, charity, dread and the fear of God *at any time* or season." "But this saying that we be justified by faith only, freely and without works, is spoken for to take away clearly all *merit* of our works as being unable to *deserve* our justification . . . and therefore wholly to ascribe the merit and deserving of our justification unto Christ only, and His most precious blood shedding."

Thus have we, Rev. Sir, *our church's* interpretation of the words "faith only" as they are used in her XI. Article. That Article refers us to the Homily for its full exposition. The Homily gives it, and in turn appeals to the teaching of the Catholic Fathers, tells us in what sense they used those words, and claims their meaning as its own, viz. that "faith only" is simply an exclusion of personal merit in the sinner from being the procuring cause of his justification, and an ascription of all desert to our Lord and His

Cross. What authority therefore has any one for saying that our XI. Article excludes the Sacraments from being God's means and instruments for conveying justifying grace to the penitent believer? Was not the sacramental system maintained in its fullest vigor by all those Catholic Fathers to whom the Homily appeals (from Origen to SS. Anselm and Bernard) as teaching "justification by faith only?" This of course is undeniable; and therefore quite consistently does the same Homily recognise the Sacraments as instrumental means (see also Art. XXVII.) of Justification. It says "Infants being baptized are by this sacrifice (i. e. of the Cross) washed from their sins;" and again "Our office is not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully and idly, after that we are baptized *or* justified, much less after that we be *made Christ's members** to live contrary to the same; making ourselves members of the devil."

Thus, Rev. Sir, do our XXXIX. Articles make a wide difference between us. In your article on Justification you interpret "faith only" so as to exclude not merely our own merits but also all sacramental media whereby justification may be given to faith. This is all right and consistent with your own principles; but remember that your principles are not, never have been, never can be, those of the Church. Our Article (you will pardon my repeating it) refers us to a document of *the church,* from which

* That you may know *how* we are made members of Christ, I refer you to the words of the Church Catechism: "In Baptism, *wherein* I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven."

we learn that "faith only" is therein to be understood as it always has been in the Catholic Church, so as simply to exclude personal desert in the sinner. Your article, as it is rightly understood by you, teaches that justification is immediate; ours (as including the teaching of the Homily which it adopts) looks to Holy Baptism as the initial means of justification; nay further, the Homily considers the two terms as interchangeable equivalents for the beginning of the new state of man.*

The broad line of division betwixt us thus discovered in the XXXIX. Articles runs also through our respective sacramental offices. The alterations which Methodists have made in our office for Baptism in order to render it available to their use, most clearly evinces this; and that though they have retained some of our introductory prayers, which however, in their system, are quite unintelligible. For instance *you* must assume that an adult who presents himself to you for Baptism, being truly penitent, having what you consider to be a living faith, and having also answered satisfactorily to the prescribed question "have you *experienced* the pardon of sin," *must be* born again, must *be* regenerated, (in your meaning of the word,) must *have received* forgiveness of sins.—And yet you pray for such a person in our words "that he coming to Holy Baptism *may receive* remission of his sins by spiritual regeneration," "give Thy Holy Spirit to this person that he *may be* born again." This language I say is to me quite unintelli-

* *Ut Supra*, "Our office is not to live unfruitfully after that we are baptized *or* justified."

gible as used by you, whereas in our office it is altogether plain. You by discarding sacramental media of Justification do and must maintain that true repentance and faith are at once and immediately rewarded by justification and regeneration (in your sense of the word), and that when they exist they are *ipso facto* proof that those graces have been received.—On the other hand, with us repentance and faith are no proof at all, no pledge whatever, that a person is regenerate and justified; but, as our Catechism teaches us, they are simply prerequisites, qualifying a person for the *reception* of the grace of Baptism, which according to the same Catechism is "a death unto sin and a *new birth unto righteousness.*"*

Hence it is that *we* do in all consistency, pray that the candidate coming to Holy Baptism "*may receive* remission of sins," "*may be* born again. But though I cannot understand the meaning you put upon these prayers, I can readily apprehend it to be different from that which our office declares; because the alterations you have made in the latter, intimates something of the sort. For instance, I find not in your office the words, "sanctify this water *to the mystical washing away of sin*,"—they occur twice in ours, and declare one of the virtues of Baptism. You were quite consistent in expunging them. Again

* I may here remark once for all, that the meaning which the term "regeneration" bears in the Church is altogether different from that which obtains out of the Church. We do not mean that regeneration is a change of the *will*, but the making a child of Adam's sinful nature a "member of Christ's *Body*." The doctrines are as essentially distinct as if they had different names.

you have stricken out the exhortations and prayers, after the administration of the Sacrament, *the very portion* which, in our office, fixes the meaning of all that precedes: e. g. "Seeing *now*, dearly beloved, that this child *is* regenerate"—"we yield Thee hearty thanks . . . that it *hath* pleased thee to regenerate this child with thy Holy Spirit. And humbly we beseech Thee to grant that he *being* dead unto sin and living unto righteousness, and *being* buried with Christ in his death, may crucify the old man, &c., and that as he *is* made partaker of the death of thy son, he may also be partaker of his resurrection, "&c. The exhortation which follows, also most clearly shows that Baptism is the beginning of the new life, and how and why that life must be pursued.

I cannot be so unjust to the founders of your society, as to suppose that they made these changes without reason. I believe that, however mistaken, they acted conscientiously; and there is the strongest evidence in what they did, that they proceeded with deliberation, and under a marked anxiety to depart from the Church of England's doctrine no farther than they could avoid. They did not, however, *believe* the doctrine of our Baptismal office; it was unmanageable by them, and inconsistent with the first principle of their religious system; and *therefore* they altered the service as they did the articles. But the dividing line does not stop here; it goes on into the Communion offices, and on your side rejects those two characteristics of that Great Mystery, which the Church has ever maintained; viz: that it is an

oblation to God the Father, and a *real* and spiritual* communication of Christ's body and blood to worthy receivers.

The first is recognized in the prayer for the Church militant, previous to which, *the Priest* is directed to place the alms *and* elements on the altar; immediately after which, God is besought to accept the alms *and* the oblations and prayers. Here our Liturgy and the English are the same—afterwards in *ours* the oblation of the Elements is repeated, in the prayer of Consecration. This oblation, which gives the Eucharist its sacrificial character, is a universal rite in the Catholic church; but you have nothing of the sort. Again the English agrees with the Roman rite, and ours with the Greek, with respect to the Invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the Elements, so that receivers may be partakers of Christ's Body and Blood; the former are without that Invocation, the latter have it.

And now in respect of what theologians call the real presence of Christ's body; you do not lay claim to any such dogma, and an alteration in one prayer which you have adopted, shows that all the sacred language which you have borrowed from us, is, like that in your Baptismal office, to be interpreted differently from the same words, as they occur in our Ritual. In the prayer which the Priest says in behalf of him-

*Another significant alteration: the Methodists have stricken out the words "spiritual manner" from our XXVIII. Article, and inserted instead "scriptural manner;" which may mean nothing or anything, just as the people please. It may mean, and in the opinion of many millions of Christians does mean, *transubstantiation*.

self and the people, there are these words: "grant us therefore gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by *His Body*," &c.; these last words you have struck out, and inserted "*His Death.*" This one act alone would show the essential difference between us, as sacrificing and rejecting the great principle of the Catholic faith, on which hangs the doctrine of the Sacraments, Regeneration, Justification, Sanctification, and the Resurrection unto Life at the Last Day—viz: the office of our Lord's glorified humanity in the salvation of men. Your founders did not believe that our fallen nature is cleansed by the glorified and divine human nature of Christ, that "our sinful bodies are made clean by *His Body*," that the latter gives us life, even as Adam's gave us death. On this principle, Rev. Sir, is built the sublime Theology of the Catholic church, this is the great exponent of her teaching, as it has come down to us from Apostolic days, and been proclaimed with one mouth in every section of the Apostolic family in every age. There is no more discordance in the tradition of the Church Catholic, in respect of this principle, than of God's existence. The Canon of Scripture itself has not the same unanimous testimony to its authenticity, that this one great all embracing doctrine has, which in Scripture, shines like the sun, throwing its rich light into every other doctrine, and explaining the whole. The Catholic faith is built upon the Incarnation of the Son of God, under the ministration of the Holy Spirit. Th 'second Adam' gives life to the fallen seed

of the first Adam, by making them "members of His body, of his flesh and of His bones." He continues that life in them, by Himself becoming their heavenly food in the Holy Communion of his Body and Blood—really, because a gift that is not real is nothing at all, and spiritually, because Himself, "the second Adam, is a life-making Spirit;" and thus they become "partakers of the Divine nature," as truly, and even as they are by truth, partakers of the fallen earthly nature of the first Adam. "For *as in Adam* all die, *even so in Christ* shall all be made alive." "The first man is of the earth, earthy; the second *man* is the Lord from Heaven." "The first man was made (an enlivened i. e. only) a living Soul, the second man a life-making (ζωοποιουν) Spirit."

It is beside my purpose, Rev. Sir, to show how the ancient Doctors of the church handled this great principle, though I have the means at hand of doing so, to some extent; my present concern is with the Church of England, and I now proceed to exhibit, from the two greatest of her modern divines, our recognised exposition of the doctrine of our Communion office, which you discarded, when to a living "life-giving" "Body" you preferred "Death."

First I quote from Hooker. Eccl. Pol. 13. v. c. 56. Ed. Keble.

"We are by nature the sons of Adam. When God created Adam he created us; and as many as have descended from Adam, have in themselves the

* If we have been *reconciled* to God by the death of his Son, much more, being reconciled, shall we be *saved* by His Life." "He *rose again* for our Justification."

root out of which they sprung....The sons of God have God's own natural son, as a second Adam from Heaven; whose race and progeny they are by a spiritual and heavenly Birth.(§6) For in Him we actually are by our actual incorporation into that society, which hath Him for their head, and doth make, together with Him, one Body, (He and they in that respect having one name,) for which cause, by virtue of this mystical conjunction, we are of Him and in Him, even as though our very flesh and bones were continuate with His. We are therefore adopted sons of God to eternal life, by participation of the only begotten Son of God, whose LIFE is the *well-spring* and cause of ours. The church is in Christ, as Eve was in Adam. Yea, *by grace*, we are every of us in Christ and in His church, *as by nature* we are in those our first parents. God made Eve of the rib of Adam. And His church He frameth *out of the very flesh, the very wounded and bleeding side of the Son of Man.* His body crucified, and His blood shed for the life of the world, are the true *elements* of that heavenly being, (i. e. the Church) which maketh us *such as* Himself is, of whom we come. For which cause the words of Adam may be fitly the words of Christ, concerning His church, "flesh of my flesh and bone of my bones," a true nature extract out of my own body*.... Adam is in us as an original cause of our nature, and of that corruption of nature which causeth death, Christ as

* Comp. St. Paul. Eph. v. 30. 32. "We are members of His body, of His flesh, and of His bones."..."This is a great Mystery. But I speak concerning Christ and the Church."

the original cause of restoration to life; the person of Adam is not in us, but his nature, and the corruption of his nature derived into all men by propagation; Christ having Adam's nature as we have, deriveth not nature but incorruption, and that immediately *from his own Person* into all that belong unto Him. *As* therefore we are really partakers of the body of sin and death received from Adam, *so* except we be truly partakers of Christ, and as really possessed of His spirit, all we speak of eternal life is but a dream. (§7) 'That which quickeneth us is the spirit of the second Adam, and *His flesh is that wherewith He quickeneth.* That which in Him made our nature incorruptible, was the union of His Deity with our nature.(§8)... These things, St. Cyril duly considering, reproveth their speeches, which taught that only the Deity of Christ is the 'vine whereupon we do depend as branches, and that neither His flesh nor our bodies are composed in this resemblance.' For doth any man doubt but that even *from the flesh of Christ* our very bodies *do receive that life, which shall make them glorious at the latter day,* and for which they are already accounted parts of his blessed body? (§9)... This, therefore, is the necessity of Sacraments. *That saving grace which Christ originally is or hath for His people,* BY SACRAMENTS, He severally deriveth into every member thereof. Sacraments serve as the instruments of God to that end and purpose ... For we take not Baptism nor the Eucharist for bare *resemblances* or memorials of things absent, neither for *naked signs* and testimonies assuring us of grace

received before, but (as they are in deed and in verity) for means effectual whereby God, *when we take the Sacraments*, delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, *which grace* the sacraments represent or signify. (c. 57. §5.) Baptism doth challenge to itself the inchoation of those graces, the consummation whereof dependeth on mysteries ensuing. We receive *Christ Jesus* in Baptism once, as the first beginner; in the Eucharist often, as being by continual degrees the finisher of our life. (§6) ... Our souls and bodies quickened unto eternal life are effects, the cause whereof is the person of Christ; His body and blood are the true well spring out of which this life floweth. So that His body and blood are in that very subject whereunto they minister life —not only by effect or operation, even as the influence of the heavens is in plants, beasts, men, and in everything which they quicken—but also by a far more divine and mystical kind of union which maketh us one with Him, "*even as** He and the Father are one." (c. 58. §6.)

Such, Rev. Sir, is the teaching of the greatest doctor in modern English theology; teaching on which our Church, both in England and America, has put her highest approval. His celebrated work on the "Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity," is, and has

* i. e. by nature; thus St. Peter speaks of our being made "partakers of the Divine nature." This is the constant doctrine of the Catholic fathers, that the children of Adam, by participation of God's Incarnate Son, become His Sons by proper relationship. Thus St. Cyril says we are sons "*naturally*, because we are *in Him* and in Him alone."

been for years, a text book for our students in Divinity, so appointed too by the authorities of the church. And as he lived in the age of Elizabeth, it can only be ignorance, or something worse, that can call teaching like his a "novelty" in the church; though doubtless such teaching is new to many whose minds are possessed by religious notions which are novelties in the church, the "*novelties which disturb our peace,*" but which are not, and never were, *of* the church.

I shall next cite a few brief but pregnant sentences from the next greatest name in the theology of modern England; one who was a contemporary of Hooker, being but two years his junior, and acknowledged to be the chief glory of the Church in the next reign: I mean Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester. "As by partaking the flesh and blood, *the substance* of the first Adam, we come to one death, so to life we cannot come unless we do participate with the flesh and blood of the 'Second Adam,' that is Christ. We drew death from the first by partaking the *substance*, and so must we draw life from the second *by the same.* This is the way; become branches of the Vine, and *partakers of his Nature*, and so of His life and verdure both."—*Sermon IX. on the Resurrection.*

Once more: "And so we pass to another Mystery, for one mystery leads to another; this in the text to the Holy Mysteries we are providing to partake, which do work like and do work to this, even to the raising of the soul with the first resurrection. And as they are a means of raising the soul out of

the soil of sin—for they are given to us, and we take them expressly for the remission of sins—so they are no less a means also for the raising our bodies out of the "dust of death." The sign of that Body which was thus in the heart of the earth, to bring us out from thence at the last. Our Saviour saith it, *totidem verbis*, "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood I will raise him up at the last day."—*Sermon VIII.*

Finally, a word from Bishop Overall, a contemporary of Andrewes, and the composer of the latter portion of our Church Catechism.

"It is confessed by all divines that upon the words of consecration the Body and blood of Christ is really and substantially present, and so exhibited and given to all who receive it; and all this not after a physical and sensual, but after an heavenly and incomprehensible manner. But there remains yet this controversy among some of them, whether the body of Christ be present only in the use of the Sacrament, and in the act of eating and not otherwise. They that hold the affirmative, as the Lutherans (Confess. Saxon.) and all Calvinists do seem to me to depart from all antiquity, which places the presence of Christ in the virtues and benediction used by the Priest and not in the use of eating the Sacrament."—"And this did most Protestants grant and profess at first, though now the Calvinists make Popish magic of it in their licentious blasphemy."

These passages are from writers, upon whose teaching the Church at large, years and years ago, placed the signet of her approval. And now I ask,

is not their doctrine as distinct from the current teaching of Methodist preachers, from John Wesley downwards, as the doctrines of the Articles, Homilies and Liturgy, are from those of your Articles and Sacramental forms? Can the hundred years' existence of Methodism produce an exposition parallel with those I have quoted from Hooker and Andrewes? No, no;—Wesleyans know nothing of any such doctrine; the English Dissenters know nothing of it; Presbyterians have nothing to do with it, neither have the so called Evangelicals and Latitudinarians in the Church. And should any one venture to bring forward any of these latter as standard writers of the Church, in contrast to the school of Hooker and Andrewes, such a presumptuous claim may be silenced by any one who shall compare them severally with the authoritative teaching of our Liturgy. Any one who can construe English, and has the consideration to take for granted that the solemn addresses to Almighty God in our ritual, are not composed in equivocal language; and that our catechism, designed for the instruction of the simple and unsophisticated minds of little children in the Christian Faith, is not made up of riddles; will be at no loss in deciding who occupy the Church's ground, who consistently maintain her principles, who really do teach *her faith* and not their own opinions. For it is neither present popularity, nor high station, that can give any individuals the title of being legitimate expounders of the *Church's* faith; but professed and proved *submission* to the teaching of the Church. And who are they,

Rev. Sir, who profess as a first principle, this submission to the authority of the Church, as unto God?

This question at once brings me to say a word about those Oxford divines, of whom I understand you discoursed largely. If they have put forth any opinions peculiar to themselves, they only are responsible for them. They ask no defence, they need none. *Salva fide*, they have the right of all Englishmen to say what they please; and as they are learned and holy men, their opinions are of course entitled to the consideration of their brethren; but being *opinions* nobody gives them further weight than each person may think them severally entitled to. Their opinions, however, (considered apart from the faith which the church teaches them,) form no system, are not common to one another, and are adopted by no party. There is no such thing as "Puseyism;" and you will surely pardon me when I tell you that I am forced to say, that that word is a slander upon our Church, a slander upon Dr. Pusey. It is I know often used without any such intention; but people should not inconsiderately bear false witness, and speak evil.

The imaginations of people are, however, possessed by a chimera which they call "Puseyism;" their ears are open to every report which may go to magnify its shocking proportions; and they are quite content to be horrified, without taking the trouble to examine the subject, nay, in most cases, without being able to examine it. How many persons, Rev. Sir, in your large audience, suppose you are entitled to any opinion whatever on the great controversy that is stirring our Church, and tasking the minds of

her most accomplished sons? And yet half the people of Carlisle are expressing their judgments on points which the greatest theologians and Bishops in our Church have spoken on with diffidence. The extracts from the controversial writings of the Oxford gentlemen, which I am told you read from a little book, and which was apparently, at least, the basis of your own judgments; have for the present supplied the multitude's appetite for horrors, or perhaps, have only awakened it anew. How fair the quotations may have been *I* cannot say, but there were those among your hearers who had happily drawn for themselves from original sources; and who were scandalized by the manifest misrepresentations which your readings imposed upon your uninformed hearers. Surely, Rev. Sir, you are not ignorant of the tricks of modern controversy; of that trick especially, which is adopted only by those who are unable to meet a learned opponent in argument, viz. to make brief extracts of startling passages from large volumes, merely *ad captandum vulgus*. The only way to refute "Puseyism," as people call it, is to meet *Dr. Pusey* and his friends on the ground which they have assumed, not to frighten the common people; for though you scare the latter from their senses, Dr. Pusey's positions and arguments still remain untouched. I am, therefore, only amazed that you should have given your confidence to a compilation of garbled passages from the Oxford writers, and should have used *it* to show the people what was the truth in controversy, instead of taking up the doctrines one by one, and examining fairly

the proofs from scripture, tradition, and the standards of *our own Church*, which are brought to sustain the several points. Now, as an illustration of the worth of such quotations you used, I will cite somewhat of Martyr Ridley (no papist I ween) from his disputation which immediately preceded his execution; and you may see whether it would not have rather heightened the effect of your exhibition, had some words of his been uttered by the Oxford gentlemen, and skilfully placed in your mosaic of "Puseyism."

e. g. "I say that both Christ and the sacrifice of Christ are there," i. e. on the altar, p. 216. (Parker Society's edition, 1843.)

"Is not the miracle great, trow you, when bread which is wont to sustain the body, becometh food to the soul," p. 223.

"I *also* worship Christ in the sacrament," p. 235. Mark the force of the word "*also.*" He is disputing with a Roman Catholic. "We do handle the signs reverently, but we worship the sacrament as a sacrament, not as a thing signified by the sacrament." "We adore and worship Christ in the eucharist, and if you mean the external sacrament, I say that also is to be worshipped as a sacrament." p. 236.

"It is His true blood which is in the chalice, I grant, and the same which sprang from the side of Christ," p. 237. Pie: "What say you to that council, where it is said that the priest doth offer an unbloody sacrifice of the Body of Christ?" Ridley: "I say it is well said if it be rightly understood." "It is called unbloody, and is offered after a certain manner

and in a mystery, and as a representation of that bloody sacrifice, and he doth not lie who saith Christ to be offered." p. 250.

To the Bishop of Lincoln. "Both you and I agree herein that in the sacrament is the very true and natural Body and Blood of Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin Mary, which ascended into Heaven, which sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, which shall come from thence to judge the quick and the dead; only we differ *in Modo,* in the way and manner of being. We confess all, one thing to be in the sacrament and dissent in the manner of being there." "A Sacramental mutation I grant to be in the bread and which truly is no small change; but such a change as no mortal man can make but only the Omnipotency of Christ's Word," p. 274.

Now, Rev. Sir, I think I am not rash in assuming that if I have here quoted from the martyr Reformer Ridley, some words that are altogether equivalent to what the Oxford Divines have put forth, I have also cited many others far more startling than any thing that is to be found in your text book of "Puseyism." "Worshipping Christ in the sacrament, worshipping the Sacrament as a Sacrament," "it is well said that the Priest doth offer an unbloody sacrifice of the Body of Christ, if it be rightly understood," "he doth not lie who saith Christ is offered." Have the Oxford Divines uttered anything so offensive to modern ears as these words of Ridley? I trow not. It would however be exceedingly unfair, nay dishonest, to exhibit these passages as an exposition of Ridley's doctrine.

They cannot be understood without the qualifying context, nor even with it, by one unversed in Catholic theology. Had you reported such hard sayings, nine out of ten of your hearers might have asked, "what qualification is possible for such words?" and then have added, "they carry with them their own condemnation in the minds of Protestants." And, Rev. Sir, just as unfair is it to attempt an exposition of the teaching of the Divines of Oxford, by giving to the multitude such quotations, as, for the sake of mere popular effect, are taken from their writings.—Nay it is not only unfair, it is an impossible task. A person who is not well read in Anglican Divinity is utterly incompetent to criticise the writings of the Oxford Divines. A Methodist or Presbyterian may be able enough to see that those Divines do teach doctrines quite different from, nay utterly antagonistic to, what Methodists and Presbyterians are respectively taught, and which of course they severally assume to be scriptural truth; but at that point, their knowledge ends; that is the limit of their capacity to judge; they do not know any thing whatever about the consistency or inconsistency of what is called Oxford teaching, with the authoritative Creed of the Church, and the standard authors in Anglican theology. They may condemn principles which are opposed to their own; every body assumes that liberty; but they have no right to condemn those principles as being inconsistent with the doctrines of the Anglican Church, when they have nothing to do with that church and know next to nothing of her authoritative teaching. Nay, Rev. Sir, those dissenters from

the Church who do not know what her teaching really is, are not backward in condemning it in as strong language as any that they bestow upon the Oxford Divines. I remember the able organ of English Calvinistic Dissenters, viz. the Eclectic Review, to have denounced our Book of Common Prayer as the most awful, "most dangerous and injurious book which the English language contains," "and by which myriads of deluded victims are blinded to their character and danger." And during the late outcry against the Education Bill in England, Dr. J. Pye Smith, perhaps the most distinguished man among the Dissenters, declared our Church Catechism to contain "some of the most awful falsehoods that were ever uttered." Nor were the Wesleyans absent from their post during that warfare against a bill which seemed to threaten their children with the fatal instruction of our Catechism. To them mainly belongs all the credit of the victory which was won; *they* stopped the progress of the bill. Now I am not one among those who can condemn the conduct of the Dissenters and Wesleyans in this matter. They acted consistently. It was impossible for them to submit quietly and see their children instructed in religious principles, antagonistic to their own; to barter what they believed to be the truth, for the poor price of the secular knowledge which was to be obtained in the government schools. I would that their conduct were in all respects as candid and straightforward as it was in this; that they would *consistently* oppose the Church if they oppose it at all; that they would direct their assaults

against her authoritative teaching, and not against particular individuals, who religiously adopt that teaching; that they would contend in short in an upright, manly way, making war upon the body, instead of professing a sort of hollow truce with the church, while they lose no opportunity of assassinating any of her faithful sons whom they can reach, "whetting their tongue like a sword and shooting out their arrows, even bitter words." No true member of the Church will regret it, if the teachers of Methodism and Presbyterianism shall show their flocks the difference between the church and them. Let them make as vigorous warfare as they please; but let their assaults be directed at principles of the Church and not at the men who maintain them. Let them set in the strongest contrast possible, the opposing features of our respective systems (the stronger the better), but let it be done truthfully and candidly; neither misrepresenting our doctrines nor shrinking from the plainest and fullest possible statement of their own; not seeking out ingenious methods of interpretation whereby an approximation between opposites might be brought about, but understanding the language of our Church just as it is written; giving the church the common credit that is accorded to serious people when they speak on serious subjects, viz. that of meaning what they say and nothing else. And then let them set in contrast to this, just what they choose, and oppose it with all the skill, ability and learning they can master. Let us in short all boldly speak out our own principles, and consistently act upon them, by developing them into their legiti-

mate consequences and into deeds. That is the way to prove them. That is the way to assure ourselves of the truth or error that may be in them, that is the shortest method of bringing to an end the painful controversies that have agitated Christendom for these three hundred years

I remain, Rev. Sir,

Your Obt. Servant,

Wm. Herbert Norris.

Carlisle, Pa., Feb. 9th, 1844.

Note A.

The works of our controversial writers are full of testimony drawn from the tradition of the Church, against the assumed catholicity of every Romish tenet or practice, condemned by the church in England. The "Oxford Tracts" contain some of the ablest and most conclusive arguments against Romanism, as distinguished from Roman *Catholicity*, that are to be found in our language. Mr. Newman's Lectures on "Romanism and Popular Protestantism," are, like every thing that proceeds from him, the work of a master, irrefutable, and I might almost say unassailable. Mr. Palmer's works are of a similar character. His "Treatise on the Church," when it first appeared, filled thoughtful English Romanists with astonishment and alarm,* and his late letters to Dr. Wiseman are an assault upon Roman errors unparalleled for their peculiar intensity and vigor. The basis of these great controversial works is the *Tradition* of the Church Catholic. Tradition is the only effectual antagonist against Roman claims and impositions. The Roman Catholic has his proof texts from Scripture as striking, and *prima facie* as conclusive, as any that any Protestant can adduce. That the words "I say unto thee thou art Peter (or a rock) and on this

* The letters of an upright and determined R. C. Priest (by the name of Rathbun) to Dr. Wiseman, on the Oxford writers, are my authority for this assertion.

rock (or Peter) I will build my Church," are an assertion which the "Bible alone" interpreters are sorely puzzled at, is proved by the miserable shifts which they adopt in order to evade the plain sense of the words. They bind themselves as a first principle to a grammatical exegesis of the sacred text; but when they come to this passage, besides many others that might be mentioned, their "principle" is laid aside, and up start half a dozen wilful interpretations *devised for no other purpose than to evade the Roman claims.* Is it too much to say that the Roman Catholic must despise such hypocrisy? Anglican Theologians on the other hand, commit themselves to that sense of our Lord's promise to St. Peter which the early Church professed. They *can* appeal to Tradition. They are willing to concede to the successors of St. Peter all the honor and pre-eminence which at first were their right, *if they will be satisfied therewith.* But until they shall accept of so much, Anglicans concede them none at all, and throw upon the Popes all the responsibility for the schisms in the Church which their usurped and tyrannical jurisdiction has occasioned. There is one precedent in Ecclesiastical History which alone makes the position of the Church of England impregnable against Rome. I mean the *quasi*-schism in the church of Antioch, with the different views respecting it, which were common to East and West; and the means adopted to heal it. The Pope (Siricius) interfered little, if any more in it than did St. Ambrose. One of the parties, i. e. the Meletian, was not in communion with Rome; and yet Meletius presided in the second General Council. Again, an Italian Council in which S. Ambrose presided, sent a letter to the Emperor respecting the schism, in which the Bishops say, that they "esteemed the two Bishops of Antioch, Meletius and Paulinus, *as Catholics.*" Ten years later, a Council at Capua under Siricius referred the case of Antioch to the Patriarch and Bishops of Egypt; and St. Ambrose wrote to Theophilus of Alexandria a letter, in which he acknowledged both of the rival Bishops (at that time Flavius and Evagrius) as "brethren"; and then says to Theophilus, "we are *of opinion* that it would be *proper* for you to refer your decision to our holy *brother* the Bishop of Rome; for we do not doubt but that the judgment you shall pronounce will meet his approbation; and the only means of establishing a solid peace, will be for us all to concur in what *you* shall *decide*, and he approve." Fleury xviii. 17. xix. 27.

Now I submit to the common sense of men, that persons who refuse to abide by the Church's traditional interpretation have no right at all to appeal to tradition against the Roman Catholic's literal interpretation of scriptural texts. It is surely most impertinent in them to cite against Rome, such a case as the above, or any other argument from Tradition, when Rome rests her claim upon Scripture. So with respect to transubstantiation. Roman Catholics appeal to numerous texts of scripture with confidence, nay with triumph. Grammatical exegesis shrinks from the contest, and turns our Lord's most awful words into rhetoric, and devises explanations which never occurred to the mind of a Christian, by the space of fifteen hundred years, until the ingenuity of Ulric Zwingle discovered that our Lord did not mean what he said. I say then again, it is most impertinent and preposterous, for any one, who adopts Zwinglian or other modern doctrines of the sacraments, to tell a Roman Catholic that transubstantiation is a new dogma. The latter's private judgment is as legitimate as any others; and all the more honestly exercised in that it professes to claim for our Lord's words their obvious signification, which the other rejects. The Anglican too, claims our Lord's words in their literal meaning, even that which was received in the early Catholic Church; viz. that the consecrated symbol is truly called Bread, and is Bread; and truly called also "The Body of Christ"; because the sacrament is a mystical Unity of which both these are real though distinct predicates; just as our Lord's own Divine Person is a Unity, of which are predicated both His Divine and Human Natures, without any confusion, conversion, or transmutation of the one substance into the other. Hence the consecrated Bread and Wine may be called the Body and Blood of Christ, just as truly and really as the *Man* Christ Jesus is called *God*.

For this view, as being most certainly the true, and Catholic, and Scriptural doctrine of the Eucharist, Anglican Divines appeal to the controversial writings of the old orthodox Fathers, on the Mystery of the Incarnation. As an example, I may cite some passages quoted by our Bishop Pearson in his exposition of the Creed. (Art. III. p. 247, note, N. Y. Ed., 1842.) They are from a work of Pope Gelasius, (who lived at the close of the sixth century,) against the Eutychian heresy, which affirmed only one substantial nature of our Lord, viz., the Divine. The human, according to Eutyches, was absorbed or

transmuted into the Divine Nature. Against this, the Pope argues thus: "Surely the Sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ, our Lord, which we take, are a Divine thing: through which, and by the same, we are made "partakers of the Divine Nature:" and yet the *substance* or *nature* of the bread and wine does not cease to be. And surely the image and similitude of the Body and Blood of Christ are shown forth in the celebration of the Mysteries. Therefore it is quite clearly shown to us that we must think of Christ our Lord Hinself, as of that which in His likeness we exhibit, celebrate, and partake; that as by the operation of the Holy Ghost, the one (i. e. the bread and wine) pass over into this Divine substance, remaining still in the proper qualities (proprietate) of their own nature; so also is it in respect of that principal Mystery (the Incarnation) itself, whose efficacy and virtue they truly represent; by their remaining properly, it is clear that they demonstrate that one, (because whole and true) Christ remains." (*Gelasius de duabus naturis, in Biblioth. Patr. Lat.* t. v. pars. 3. p. 671.) The same argument is found in the second dialogue of Theodoret, between Eranistes a Eutychian and Orthodoxus a Catholic. From these it appears that the Mystery of the incarnation is an exact parallel to that of the Eucharist, and we may argue from the known nature of the one, to the other. As Pope Gelasius and Theodoret argued from the nature of the Eucharist, to prove against the Eutychians, that in the unity of our Lord's Divine person there were two distinct, incommutable, and permanent natures; so may and do our divines argue against Romanists from the Catholic doctrine of the Incarnation; and prove that in the Unity of the Eucharist there are two distinct incommuted and incommutable substances or natures, viz., "the outward and visible sign *and* the inward spiritual grace." Hence, also, it may be remarked, that these two Divine Mysteries mutually protect each other. The Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist is an effectual shield on the one hand against Sabellianism, Nestorianism, and Socinianism. For one may well ask how incorporation into the body of a *human* person can regenerate the fallen sons of Adam and make them sons of God; how a partaking of the body and blood of a *human* person can give us any other life than that we have already. So on the other hand, is the same doctrine a safeguard against Eutychianism. But the premises of transubstantiation involve and may support the Eutychian Heresy, if not also that of the

Gnostics, who affirmed among other follies, that our Lord's Body was a phantasm, exhibiting the "species" or "accidents" of humanity, but not having the substance.* In like manner the old and now perhaps abandoned Lutheran and Calvinistic doctrines of the Eucharist, which destroy the unity of the Sacrament (the one, making by virtue of the assumed ubiquity of our Lord's Body the mere indwelling thereof "in with and under" the Bread and Wine; the other separating the grace from the symbol) lead directly to Nestorianism; and the Zuinglian to Socinianism. And perhaps we here have an explanation of the Apostacy of Protestant Switzerland into Socinianism; and of the

* "It [transubstantiation] giveth occasion to heretics to maintain and defend their errors; as to Marcion, which said that Christ had but a phantastical body; and to Eutyches, which wickedly confounded the two natures of Christ." Bp. Ridley—*Disputation at Oxford.*

The use of this argument against the Roman doctrine, by Ridley, proves his own view of the Eucharist to have been that which I have claimed as catholic. He could not have argued from the Incarnation against an erroneous view of the Eucharist, unless he believed the "great mystery of godliness" ("*magnum sacramentum pietatis*") to have a parallel in that other mystery which is its perpetual manifestation in the Church.

As another perspicuous statement of the same view compare the following: "Cyprian the Martyr shall tell you *how* it is that Christ calleth it, saying PANIS *est corpus, cibus, potus, caro, &c.* BREAD is the Body, meat, drink, flesh, because that *unto this material substance* is given *the property* of the thing whereof it beareth the name." S. Cyprian's words, as quoted by the Editor, are "Ipse enim et panis, et caro, et sanguis; idem cibus et substantia et vita factus est Ecclesiæ suæ, quam corpus suum appallat, dans ei participationem spiritus." i. e. For Himself is *both bread,* and *flesh and blood;* the same has become both the food and life of His Church which He calls His Body, giving to it a participation of [His] Spirit.—*Conferences between Bourne and Ridley.—Works, p.* 161.

almost universal prevalence of Nestorianism and *quasi*-Sabellianism in what are called Orthodox Protestant denominations.†

† The proof is, the extraordinary popularity of Mr. Jacob Abbott's writings, and such like works; and the prevailing spirit of irreverence that can dare to think or speak of our Lord otherwise than as God.

The unlearned reader may be informed that Nestorianism holds that our Lord has a human as well as Divine *personality;* i. e. it denies that Almighty God the Son was properly born of the Virgin, but only a man in whom the Divine nature dwelt. Sabellianism is the denial of the Divine personality of the Son and Holy Ghost, and teaching that our Lord was a human person in whom was a manifestation or functions of the Deity.

NOTE B.

The argument in the foregoing letter, although directed specially against Methodism, has of course a general bearing, equally strong, against all who maintain in common with the Methodists, those peculiar views on the Rule of Faith, the means of Justification, and the Sacraments, which I have shown cannot be ascribed to the Anglican Church. It was not mere wilfulness by which the original Methodists were guided, when they altered our XXXIX. Articles and Liturgy. However much mistaken they may have been, in their judgments, or rash, or deficient in theological knowledge; no one can justly deny them to have been serious and conscientious men, who proposed to themselves a high aim, and pursued it with unfaltering zeal. Their own principles they understood well enough, and they saw that those were inconsistent with the theological system of the XXXIX. Articles. By altering those Articles and the Liturgy, they condemned the Church, and of course are in turn, so far forth condemned by the Church; so also, are their principles, by whomsoever held, virtually under the same condemnation. Having seen what the Lutheran spirit has done with our Articles and Liturgy where it had free scope; we may presume, of course, that it would do the like again if it had a similar opportunity. The restlessness which is continually shown under our Baptismal office, the fanciful interpretations and ingenious theories that are devised to explain away its doctrine, all point to the same

end. But the XXXIX. Articles expressly acknowledge that doctrine, and therefore are altogether as untenable ground for the Lutherans as the Baptismal office. This important fact needs to be insisted on. The doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration carries with it the Catholic Sacramental System, and therefore claims the Articles for that System. It should be borne in mind also, that every Roman doctrine condemned by the Church of England, is specified in the Articles; but there is not the smallest hint that Rome is in error in respect of Baptism. That doctrine was never in controversy between the two Communions. Their agreement therefore in it, is absolute and entire; equally as in the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation. Hence, it is undeniable that the XXXIX. Articles are utterly irreconcilable with the modern Lutheran anti-sacramental doctrine of Justification.

THE

FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH

VINDICATED FROM

ALL AFFINITY WITH METHODISM:

IN A REVIEW

OF THE LETTER OF THE REV. J. P. DURBIN, D. D., ASSERTING THEIR IDENTITY.

BY WM. HERBERT NORRIS, M. A.,

RECTOR OF ST. JOHN'S CHURCH, CARLISLE, PA.

PHILADELPHIA:
GEORGE & WAYNE, 26 SOUTH FIFTH STREET.
1844.

KING AND BAIRD, PRINTERS, 9 GEORGE STREET.

"I protest and openly confess, that in all my doctrine and preaching, both of the Sacrament and of other my doctrine, whatsoever it be, not only I mean and judge those things *as the Catholic Church and the most holy fathers of old, with one accord,* have meant and judged, but also I would gladly use the same words that they used, and not use any other words, but to set my hands to all and singular their speeches, phrases, ways, and forms of speech, which they do use in their treatises upon the Sacrament, and to keep still their interpretation."

Archbishop Cranmer, Appeal at his Degradation.

"The Sacraments of Baptism and of His Holy Supper, if we rightly use the same, do most assuredly certify us, that we be partakers of His Godly Nature, *having given* unto us by Him immortality and life everlasting, and *so* is Christ, *naturally* in us. And *so* we be one with Christ, and Christ with us, *not only* in will and mind, but *also* in very *natural properties.*"

CRANMER, Remains, v. ii. p. 407.

"You flee from the four proper matters that be in controversy unto a new scope devised by you that I should absolutely deny the presence of Christ, and say that the Bread doth *only signify* Christ's Body *absent*, which thing I NEVER SAID NOR THOUGHT. And as Christ saith not so, nor Paul saith not so, then so likewise I say not so, and my book in divers places *saith clean contrary.*"

Ib. v. iii. p. 40.

"And yet *the Bread is changed,* not in shape nor substance, but *in nature*, as Cyprian truly saith, not meaning that the natural substance of bread is clear gone, but that by God's Word there is added thereto another higher property, nature and condition. . . . So that now the said *mystical Bread* is both a corporal food for the body and a spiritual food for the soul."

Ib. v. ii. p. 340. Jenkyns' Edition.

REVIEW.

The same reasons which led me in the first instance to give a public and pointed contradiction to Dr. Durbin's assertion of the identity of the fundamental doctrines taught respectively by the Methodists and the Church of England, induce me to notice the Letter, which purports to be a reply to the one I addressed to him. My object was then simply to correct the erroneous opinions to which he had given currency, and which I found were believed on his authority; my purpose now is the same. The letter is not less calculated to lead ill-informed persons astray from the truth than his public discourses.

When I learned that Dr. Durbin had proposed to deliver a discourse on what he and others think fit to call "Puseyism," I felt nowise anxious; nor did I imagine that I should ever be called upon to notice anything he might choose to say on such a subject. Even after I had known of his extraordinary assertion of the identity of Methodism with the Church, in respect of the three fundamental points discussed by him, I felt equally indifferent about the matter, and expressed my indifference to others. It did not for once occur to me that any one would believe what was so notoriously otherwise, even though it had been said by the Rev. and dignified President of Dickinson College. I thought, but as it seems too hastily, that our Book of Common Prayer was at least as well known in this community as Dr. Durbin; and accordingly I took it for granted, that any one who might choose to form an opinion on the subject, would examine the very plain language of that book, and judge for himself of the extravagance of his statements. Even if a person uncatechised in the faith of the Church, and with a mind preoccupied by an antagonist system, should not be able to understand all he might

see in our Prayer Book, and know, for example, what was meant by Regeneration in Baptism; still he could see that such a doctrine was therein taught most distinctly; and seeing that, he would know of course, that on such fundamental points as the New Birth of the Gospel, and Justification, the Church must be at the farthest remove from Methodism, as inculcating a religious system, not merely unlike the latter, but heterogeneous to it. But unhappily, I discovered that this very obvious way of arriving at a just judgment in so important a case, was overlooked by some for whom I naturally felt a deep concern. I had therefore no alternative. An imperious sense of duty obliged me to contradict with proofs, the erroneous notions proclaimed by Dr. Durbin. I could not degrade my pulpit with such a controversy, even so far as therein to take the remotest notice either of Methodism, or of Dr. Durbin's assertions; and my only course, was to address him publicly on the subject.

I am not surprised to find that I have made him uneasy: nor to hear his dolorous complaints, not simply on account of the manner in which I expressed myself, but because I joined issue with him on his assertion, that Methodism was identical with the Church system on the three points he discussed. He seems to think, that I ought rather to have entered upon a regular defence of the writings of certain divines of Oxford; and thus to have obtruded my assistance not only where it was not needed, but where it would have been highly indelicate, and perhaps injurious to them. I beg to say then, that under no circumstances could I engage in such a controversy with Dr. Durbin. He might have preached his lifetime out on the writings of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman, without having been troubled with a word from me. The little that I did say of those divines, in my Letter, was drawn from me by the fact that their names and writings are, against their own will, made a 'touchstone of opinion,' and are identified with principles which are the common heritage of every member of the Church; so that unhappily it is almost impossible effectually to assert and maintain those principles as the property of the Church, without appearing to be the advocate of men. Nor again, if Dr. Durbin, like his brother Wesleyans in England, had denounced our Church for her erro-

neous teaching, would I have cared to give him a word of reply. I should have felt satisfied that her own reputation was her all sufficient defence. But indeed I could not treat his proffered compliments with the same calm indifference. Our people are not used to attacks by such weapons, by sugared pills of poison. And therefore, even at the risk of being charged with arrogance, I was forced to hand him back his compliments. But hereupon I am told, with admirable *naivete*,

"A good Christian would have thought that the declaration of a strict agreement between the Methodist Episcopal and Protestant Episcopal churches on three fundamental points of Christianity would have gratified your pride, if not edified your apostolic charity."

Now granting that I may be chargeable with pride, still one is at a loss to conceive how it possibly could be gratified by hearing that we bore any affinity with Methodism; and as to "apostolic charity," I have learned from St. Paul, that that greatest of the Christian graces 'rejoices' only 'in the truth.' No matter then what was or was not "dreamed" by Dr. Durbin; even supposing his "christian communion of more than a million members" were ten times its present size, and "*three years older*" (*risum teneatis amici?*) than that of which I am an unworthy servant, the case would not be in the slightest degree altered. It would not be *true* that the Methodists are agreed with the church in her faith; and "apostolic charity" would rather be grieved than edified, at hearing such statements as those which he has hazarded. The church in the United States is nowise ashamed of being a "little flock." She would have cause to suspect herself wanting in some notes of Apostolicity, were she popular with the world; because "as He is, so are we, in this world;" "the world knoweth us not, because it knew Him not."

All therefore that Dr. Durbin says about my "changing the issue," and "making a new issue," amounts to nothing more than an unconscious confession, that he has taken too much upon himself in asserting the agreement of Methodism with the Church, in fundamentals. I made no issue whatever, new or old; I simply joined with him in an issue made by himself. He made the statement which I have combated, publicly, in his "own proper" person; whether incidentally or not, is nothing to me. It was *not* therefore "discourteous" in me to address him "publicly," in

order to disprove what he said. Whether it was necessary or not to do so, I am the judge and not he. Neither can it be "unfair" nor "uncandid" under any circumstances to controvert error by means of truth—Dr. Durbin's complaints to the contrary notwithstanding.

Of course I have nothing to do with his motives in delivering his unfortunate discourses; and I only notice what he says of them, to direct attention to a secret which he has divulged, and which a well judging public never would have guessed at. He writes to me,

"The 'Oxford teaching' which you had *stealthily** and gradually introduced into the community here, together with the general excitement in the Protestant churches, led, without my knowledge, to a resolution of the leaders' meeting of our Church, requesting me to deliver a series of discourses on the Oxford doctrines."

Here we are gravely informed that this mock-Vatican conclave, "the leaders' meeting," undertook the presentation of me and my official ministrations, to the notice of the Rev. Doctor in Divinity, the President of Dickinson College, for the sake of engaging him to lift his puissant arm against me. It would have been well for him had he simply told his "leaders' meeting" to give heed to St. Paul's advice, "to study to be quiet and to do their own business," instead of lending himself to be the mouth-piece of their impertinence. And to do him nothing less than justice, it becomes me to acknowledge that he did "hesitate" before he proceeded to act upon their presentation. But the "leaders" were not to be so easily put off; they urged that many besides their own congregation desired his action in this matter. "Still he hesitated." He 'received several messages from respectable citizens asking his compliance;' and 'one gentleman not a Methodist called on him personally;' at last this interesting coquetry ended, by his yielding a qualified assent to the urgent suit, because he was "unwilling to awaken religious controversy in the community." His discourses therefore, despite the load of apologies they contained, and the disclaimers of a direct condemnation of any thing or any body, were yet aimed at me person-

* It cannot be expected that I should make any reply to this gratuitous insult, especially since it loses all point in being supremely ridiculous.

ally and at my official teaching. All this unlooked for information chimes in, most harmoniously to be sure, with his complaint.

"To attempt to give the controversy a personal bearing by addressing your pamphlet to me in my own proper name and office, to say the least, was unnecessary and discourteous."

Again, he seems to think it strange that I should have replied to "reported statements." My justification is, that I knew the report I used, to be true. The knowledge I acted on, was derived from half-a-dozen independent sources, each one giving concordant testimony to the fact, that he had asserted the identity of Methodism with the Church's doctrine, on three fundamental points. I acted upon the highest moral certainty. Dr. Durbin's hand and seal would not have added strength to the conviction. If my information had proved false, then there might have been some ground for complaint, and I should have been a fair mark for sarcasm. But since it was true; since he confesses its truth, and writes a pamphlet to prove those very reported statements which I criticised and denied; it betrays something like the petulance of a spoiled child, for him to refer in the manner he does to the sources of my information. It would at least have been more manly in him to have stood by his declaration without any of this pitiful ado.

He is also much aggrieved because I stated a matter of fact, that "there were those among his hearers who were scandalized by the manifest misrepresentations which his readings imposed upon his uninformed hearers." (See my letter, p. 29.) Now this certainly is a fact whether those persons were justly scandalized or not. Be it observed however, that I was careful not to impeach his character in this statement. I assumed that he had not himself made the quotations which he used; but, that he read them from a "little book" purporting to be a "confutation of Puseyism;" to which book he had given an undue confidence; and therefore, that he deceived others only because he had been in the first instance deceived himself. The quotations I adduced from Ridley were made to show, how easily such a book might have been constructed. I may, however, have been more charitable to Dr. Durbin than just; at least, the startling developments of his capacity for misrepresentation, which are found in his Letter, would suggest such a conclusion. Of these I shall say nothing

at present. They will be brought to light in the course of my remarks.

I proceed now to an examination of the means which Dr. Durbin has used to overthrow my former arguments, and to establish his original assumption of the identity of Methodism and the Church's doctrine, on the Rule of Faith, the means of Justification, and the Eucharist.

1. Of the Rule of Faith.*—Dr. Durbin begins his discussion of this point with a very imposing air. He publishes our VIth Article and the corresponding Methodist Article, side by side, and then triumphantly asks me, "Are they not identical? How then could you publish to the world that they are opposed?" The simple answer is that I did not "publish to the world that they are opposed" in their letter; but that he gave an interpretation to the VIth Article which the XXth would not warrant; and which the discipline of the church and her uniform practice denied. My words were these:—

"You *read* our VIth Article so as to make it exclude the authority and tradition of the Church Catholic from having any interference in the Church's Rule of Faith for individuals. In the first place I deny that the Article makes any *such exclusion;* for itself appeals to tradition to support its own decision as to the character of the apocryphal books... Secondly, the XXth Article declares that the Church hath authority in controversies of faith, and presupposes her paramount right to expound Scripture, by saying that she ought not to *decree* any thing against the same, nor besides the same, to *enforce* any thing to be *believed* for necessity of salvation. The whole of this article also the Methodists from the necessities of their condition have rejected."

Now the ground here taken is extremely simple. It is assumed that the VIth and XXth Articles, which are both constituent portions of one document, are consistent with each other, and *must be* so interpreted. It was not only granted, but maintained by me, that the Church requires nothing to be believed as an Article of the faith but what may be proved by Holy Scripture; this is the injunction of the VIth Article; but does this deny, or is it anywise inconsistent with the fact, that the Church demands of

* Let it be noted that our Church has nowhere used this phrase, "the Rule of Faith." She does not say that Scripture is *the* Rule, nor the "only Rule;" neither does she say that Tradition is a rule. She asserts simply that Scripture *contains* all things necessary to salvation; and besides that she imposes a Creed, one Article of which is, "I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church."

her members submission to the faith she teaches, and which she maintains may be proved by Holy Scripture? Methodists may indeed read their Article as it suits them, and make it exclude all creeds; but with us it is happily quite different: for in the interpretation of the VIth Article we are bound to heed the XXth also, which asserts the Church's "*authority* in controversies *of faith;*" and her right to *enforce* certain truths to *be believed for necessity of salvation,* if they are susceptible of scriptural proof. But who is the judge of this proof? The Church does not enter into disputes with her children. She does not stoop to the work of bandying texts of Scripture with the misbelieving. Suppose then, that one of her ministers or members should refuse to abide by the Nicene formula (ομοουσιον) "consubstantial," on the ground that he could find no such word in Scripture, (and this was the very position of the Arians); would his private judgment, or would the VIth Article, save him from excommunication? Certainly not; for the Church has ruled (Art. VIII.) that the Nicene Creed may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture—the Arian's private judgment to the contrary notwitstanding.

It is really irksome to multiply words on a point so very plain as this. The Church *does* claim and exercise authority in controversies of faith. Her Creed *is* a rule of faith to her members, for she imposes it upon them to be believed. To assent to the authority and inspiration of Holy Scripture is not her only term of communion. The Arian may, and does do that, and so do many others with whom she holds no communion, whose creed varies from hers. As she knows but one Lord, so she acknowledges but One Body, One Faith, and One Baptism. She requires of those who seek her Baptism in order to gain membership in the one Body, the obligation, that they shall believe all the Articles of that one Faith. She moreover prescribes a form of daily worship and offices for the administration of the Sacraments, which appointments are binding on her clergy. In those formularies her creed is developed, and is thereby still further imposed on her worshipping members under the most solemn sanctions. They are required to address Almighty God in her prayers; and those prayers are so constructed, I repeat, as to be

at the same time confessions of her faith—confessions (would that we all might think of it!) which are made to Almighty God, the searcher of hearts, the judge of men. It is, I say, under such awful circumstances as these, that her members are obliged to confess *to God*, the truth of the doctrines taught in her daily service, in her office for Baptism, and in the Liturgy of the Holy Communion—doctrines which it is the fashion of the day to decry, doctrines as old as the Church, and which the Methodists and many others have repudiated and denounced as "Popery" and "Puseyism!" Is there not here a most serious interference with her members, in the formation of their belief? Is not her definite creed thus made a rule for their faith from lisping infancy to extremest age? This Creed is her authoritative tradition. It is handed down (*traditur*) from Bishop to Bishop, from generation to generation. She claims that it is "the faith once delivered to the saints." The time cannot be named when she cannot prove it to have been believed throughout the Catholic Church. It did not originate in the sixteenth century; for her chief documents and devotions in which it is expressed, were in use in the Church before the Reformation. It has been received "always, every where, and by all;" it is therefore the Catholic Faith; the same faith by which the lives of the saints were moulded, and which supported her Confessors and Martyrs under their fiery trials.

It is quite astonishing how any one can deny that the Church does impose and enforce her "authoritative traditional creed" upon her members, as a rule for their individual faith, when it is a fact visible to one's eyes, and seen every day, every where and by every body. The prescribed discipline of the Church, moreover, ought surely to be regarded as the best exponent of her avowed principles; and the same remark may also be made with respect to the Methodist communion. A comparison of the practices of the two will therefore show what has been elsewhere proved, to wit, the essential difference in their principles in regard to this vital point. Now with us a Creed, and consequently a Christian profession, are imposed upon infants; and that before they are conscious of so great a blessing. These questions *e. g.* are put to the sponsors in Baptism—"Dost thou [in the name of this child] believe all the Articles of

the Christian faith as contained in the Apostles' Creed?" "Wilt thou be baptized in *this faith?*" An answer in the affirmative is made a condition of the gift of regeneration. The Methodists, on the other hand, having no authoritative Creed, and differing from us essentially as to what Baptism is, have rejected this feature of our office; and consequently, they commit themselves to a practice, as anti-catholic, as it is anti-Scriptural, of conferring baptism without imposing a Creed, without any profession of faith on the part of the candidate, without any obligation being imposed upon him whatever. And yet with this astounding circumstance before their eyes, persons can be bold enough to say that Methodists are agreed with the Church in her fundamental principles! Moreover, a catechism is prescribed by the church for the instruction of her children in the faith, and which they they are to be taught so soon as they can learn it; and that is before they are able to exercise their private judgment upon Scripture. Here then, the teaching of the Church is a rule for them antecedent to all personal knowledge of Scripture. So soon as they are sufficiently instructed in the catechism, they are to be brought to the Bishop to be confirmed; at which time they publicly recognize the obligations which were imposed on them "in Baptism, wherein they were made members of Christ and children of God"—obligations which rest upon the gift of regeneration, and the gracious relation of Sonship. Is it not therefore seen, how the blessed authority and protection of the Church is extended over her children, so as to "bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord," and to save them from the great misery of ever being obliged to choose a religion? Is it not seen, I ask again, how her Creed is made a rule of their faith? But the practice of the Methodists is as different as possible from this. Their baptized children are not recognized as Church members. They have rejected our Church catechism, because it is utterly antagonistic to their religion; they have no rite to which they give the name of Confirmation, thus abandoning one of the "first principles of the doctrine of Christ," (Heb. vi. 1); and in baptizing infants, as I have said, they neither impose upon them any Creed, nor require that they shall be brought up in the belief of any thing whatever. They are thus emphatic-

ally left to themselves, to their own wills, or to the religious whims of their parents; to their own private judgment, to believe nothing or any thing as it may suit them; to construct such a creed from Scripture as shall please themselves, or to become infidels outright. And yet the Methodists call themselves "a Church!"

I have doubtless said enough on this point; but as I am anxious to leave nothing unsaid, I cannot forego the exhibition of some further documentary evidence. My appeal now shall be to the vows which are imposed on our Candidates for the Holy Order of Priests. The Methodists have partly followed us here, and partly not; and the alterations which they have made will, by the contrast, reveal their point of departure from our principles. They agree with us in exacting a vow corresponding to the VIth Article; as this by itself, would not exhibit the ground taken by the Church, so the Ordinal has a vow answering to the XXth Article; and this the Methodists have consistently altered to correspond with their rejection of that Article. I place them side by side.

FROM THE CHURCH ORDINAL.	FROM THE METHODIST DISCIPLINE.
Will you then give your faithful diligence, always so to minister the doctrine and the Sacraments and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, *and as this Church hath received the same,* according to the commandments of God; so that you may teach the people committed to your cure and charge, with all diligence to keep and observe the same?	Will you then give your faithful diligence always so to minister the doctrine and Sacraments and discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded?

From this example is seen on the one hand, professed obedience to the authoritative teaching of the church; and on the other hand, a loose rein given to the individual's will and private judgment. The Methodists, as it were, in bitterest irony of themselves, do not dare to impose their creed and discipline as *that* which the Lord hath commanded. In our Ordinal provision is made for the security of the laity. If the Priests not only profess, but pay implicit submission to the authority and teaching of the Church, the people are in no danger of being led off by

their pastors into heresy and schism. They will be saved from the ignominy of being disciples of men; from the self-condemning reproach of bearing any such name as "Wesleyans." Had John Wesley been faithful to the vow which he made before the altar of his God, he would not have been the founder of a schism; there never would have been any such body known, as the "Methodist Episcopal Church."

But I have another witness. In the order for the consecration of Bishops, the candidate is required to make the following awful oath:

"In the name of God, Amen. I *N.* chosen Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in *N.* do promise conformity and *obedience* to the *doctrine,* discipline and worship of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America: So help me God through Jesus Christ."

The Methodists, with unswerving consistency to their principles and circumstances, exact nothing like this from their "Bishops."

It was with the knowledge of all these solemn vows which rest upon our Bishops and Priests, that I took the liberty of thus expressing on p. 27 of my Letter, what he chooses to regard as my "fear of the great weight of living authority in the Church:"

"Any one who can construe English, and has the consideration to take for granted that the solemn addresses to Almighty God in our ritual, are not composed in equivocal language, and that our catechism, designed for the instruction of the simple and unsophisticated minds of little children in the Christian Faith is not made up of riddles; will be at no loss in deciding who occupy the Church's ground, who consistently maintain her principles, who really do not teach *her faith,* and not their own opinions. For it is neither present popularity, nor high station that can give any individuals the title of being legitimate expounders of the *Church's* faith: but professed and proved *submission* to the teaching of the Church."

Fear indeed! such language looks like it, forsooth. Furthermore, Dr. Durbin has the assurance to make the following startling assertion in reference to the last sentence of the passage:—"This a very convenient way of disposing of three-fourths of your own Bishops including your own diocesan, who have declared against you in America, and of a greater proportion in England." In other words, Dr. Durbin thinks that three fourths of the American Bishops and a greater proportion of the English, have forsworn themselves, by denying that they owe *obedience*

to the doctrine of the Church ! And because I say that "professed and *proved submission* to the teaching of the Church," is necessary to their being recognized as "legitimate expounders of the *Church's* faith," I dispose of their authority ! Dr. Durbin has incautiously published a calumny against our Bishops. I cannot believe that he was aware of the vows which are upon them, when in his anxiety to "dispose" of me, he penned that amazing sentence. It is not true that three-fourths of our Bishops have declared against any point that I have maintained. On the contrary it is well known that I am supported by a large majority. But certain it is that there is a very serious controversy going on in the church ; certain it is, that two rival and antagonist theological systems are contending for the upper hand now, as in the days of the original puritans. Both cannot be the property of the Church ; and the advocates of each cannot be *really* obeying the doctrine of the Church. One or the other must be in the wrong ; and yet I will not believe but that all unfeignedly suppose that they are submitting *ex animo* to the Church's teaching. These are days of confusion and mental distraction. The Church is awaking out of the stupor of the eighteenth century, brought upon her by the loss, in one dire moment, of her most learned and faithful clergy, under the measures of that bloodstained and impure villain William III ; by the lifeless latitudinarian teaching of his creatures Tillotson, Burnet, and the like ; and by the bondage she is under to the civil power ; all which evils affect the Church in this country, for we are all members of one Body, and have common nerves. It will not do then to judge men too strictly for the sins of their fathers ; and the most that it becomes one to say is that the "fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge." At all events, this is plain, and it may be said without judging the character of any body : the advocates of one of these rival systems are loud in calling for submission to the teaching of the Church ; the advocates of the other (Dr. Durbin being witness) reclaim against any such demand, and maintain that their "private judgment" is a higher rule for them than the Faith of the Church. Here is the point; there is no dispute as to the supreme authority of Holy Scripture, no question as to its *containing* all doctrine necessary to salvation ;

but the debate is, as to whether the individual's interpretation shall countervail, and even set aside that interpretation which the Church gives, which she has always maintained, and which is identical with her "authoritative traditional faith." Let then the impartial observer say which of these contending parties, judging them by these their own acts, have the most rightful claim to be recognized as legitimate expounders of the Church's faith. At all events, Dr. Durbin will surely not venture in future to cite against me or any one else, the authority of any Bishop whom *he* believes to have declared against "submission to the teaching of the Church;" because such authority must be *ipso facto* no authority at all. I cannot, however, answer for the propriety of one who charges me with departing from the doctrine of the Church, because I maintain the paramount authority of that doctrine; who places that authority below the right which he thinks we all have to form our own religious opinions, and at the same time exalts before me (p. 38) the authority of particular individuals "who *ought rightfully to control* my opinions!" Certainly this is well done, for an advocate of the individual's rightful independence of Church authority, Catholic tradition, and Creeds, in the formation of his belief and opinions. I beg to say that the clergy and laity of the Church know of no such bondage as that which Dr. Durbin thinks I "*ought*" to know and feel "to some extent at least." To no extent, I answer. Those of us who know what are their privileges in the Church, are able to rejoice in a freedom which is not to be found except within her pale, and by submission to her divinely constituted authority; freedom from self-will and the "itching ear," (2 Tim. iv. 3), freedom "from all false doctrine, heresy and schism," freedom which the Church only can bestow, and which the "pillar and ground of the Truth, the Church of the Living God" (1 Tim. iii. 15) only can guarantee. For "if the truth shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

The word "tradition" is a great scarecrow in certain quarters; and by the help of some coarse language in our first Homily, which Dr. Durbin seems to delight in, he has no doubt, made it appear more offensive than is common. He has thus shown his usual cleverness in saying things for effect. From what has

been said on pp. 8 and 9 of my Letter, together with what is here submitted,* my meaning of the word may be gathered; and an examination of our Homilies will show that they make quite as much use of tradition as I am disposed to do, and the same use. By some people the word is supposed to mean hearsay rumors carried from mouth to mouth. But such tradition is repudiated by all Church writers; such is not the Catholic Creed, nor Catholic Tradition; such is not the testimony of the Holy Fathers and Saints and Martyrs of the Church, to "the truth as it is in Jesus." It is not to such testimonies as these that the first Homily refers when it speaks of the "stinking puddles of men's traditions devised *by men's imaginations.*" The doctrine of the Trinity and the doctrine of the Incarnation, as defined by the General Councils of the Church, are *Catholic traditions.* The very Homily from which Dr. Durbin's taste selected the above sentence, appeals to tradition, by referring to the teaching of the "great clerk and godly preacher St. John Chrysostom." The authority and teaching of more than forty of the Fathers is constantly appealed to by the Homilies as that which we ought to follow. They say that "the Primitive Church is specially to be followed as most incorrupt and pure," (2 B. ii. pt. 3.) and they speak of those six councils† which were

* For some observations on the Right of private judgment and kindred matters see Appendix A.

† To wit, Nice, A. D. 325. Constantinople, A. D. 381. Ephesus, A. D. 431. Chalcedon, A. D. 451. Constantinople, A. D. 553. Constantinople, A. D. 680.

In this connection it will be instructive to consider the following extracts from the credentials furnished our delegates to the Oriental Church, as showing both whom we regard as members of the Catholic family, and what we acknowledge as the true basis of Catholic communion.

"The arrogant assumptions of universal supremacy and infallibility, of the Papal head of the Latin Church, render the prospect of speedy and friendly intercourse with him dark and discouraging. The Church in the United States of America, therefore, looking to the Triune God for His blessings upon its efforts for unity in the Body of Christ, turns with hope to the patriarch of Constantinople, the spiritual head of the ancient and venerable Oriental Church."

"They [the delegates] will make it clearly understood that their church has no ecclesiastical connexion with the followers of Luther and Calvin, and takes no part in their plans or operations to diffuse the principles of their sects."

Again—"they will present themselves . . . to the patriarch of Constantinople,

allowed and received of all men. (*Ib.* pt. 2.) Dr. Durbin's citation from the first Homily is therefore quite gratuitous. His application of the words "stinking puddles," &c., to the tradition which I have maintained is a gross misrepresentation of the Homily. His request that I should read that Homily in my Church is excessively rude, and so is his invitation to me to review my ordination vows. Again, when he speaks of my using "the authoritative words of the Roman Catholic Church in defining tradition," viz. as "that which has been believed always every where, and by all;" and says that I thereby show clearly that I receive tradition as a rule of faith in the same sense as that Church;" he proves that he does not know what he is writing about. Those words are the original words of a writer who lived in the early part of the fifth century. They are taken from the Commonitory of St. Vincent of Lerins and are universally referred to by theologians as the "Canon of Vincentius."* Equally absurd is it to say, that I hold tradition in the same sense as the Roman Catholic Church; for if I did, I could not but be a Roman Catholic, I could not but acknowledge the Creed of

inviting him to a friendly correspondence with the heads of the Church in the United States, explaining more fully the views and objects of their Church, and inquiring whether a mutual recognition of each other can be effected, as members of the Catholic Church of Christ, on the basis of Holy Scriptures *and the first councils*, including the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, in order to a future efficient co-operation against Paganism, false religion and Judaism." Dated 2d January, 1843, and signed by the late Senior Bishop Griswold, and by the Bishops of New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Missouri, and Pennsylvania.

* St. Vincent's words are worth heeding. "Inquiring often with great desire and attention of very many excellent holy and learned men, how and by what means I might assuredly, and as it were by some general and ordinary way, discern the true Catholic faith from false and wicked heresy; to this question I had usually this answer from them all, that whether I or any other desired to find out the fraud of heretics daily springing up, and to escape their snares, and willingly would continue in a sound faith, himself safe and sound, that he ought two manner of ways by God's assistance to defend and preserve his faith; that is, first, by the authority of the law of God; secondly, by the tradition of the Catholic Church."

"Again, within the Catholic Church itself we are greatly to consider that we hold that which hath been believed *every where, always and of all men;* for that is truly and properly *Catholic* (as the very force and nature of the word doth declare) which comprehendeth all things in general after an universal manner, and that

Pope Pius and the Council of Trent, I could not but maintain that there are articles of faith found elsewhere than in Holy Scripture, viz., as the Council of Trent says, in "unwritten traditions." But it seems that some how or other, right or wrong, I am to be proved not only a "Papist," but something worse. He says:

"You show clearly that you receive tradition in the same sense as that Church and even in a *stronger sense*, for you say, (p. 20) 'There is no more discordance in the tradition of the Church Catholic in respect of this principle *than of God's existence.*' Verily this is strange language in a Protestant community."

Verily, I reply, to do as Dr. Durbin has here done, is stranger conduct in a community that expects men to have at least some regard for truth. How could he have the hardihood to take those words of mine which I used in speaking of the Incarnation and Salvation by the "Word made flesh," and give out that I thus spoke of tradition. Here is the connexion in which those words occur.

"Your founders did not believe that our fallen human nature is cleansed by the glorified and divine human nature of Christ, that, 'our sinful bodies are made clean by *His Body*,' that the latter gives us life even as Adam's gave us death. On this principle, Rev. Sir, is built the sublime Theology of the Catholic Church, this is the great exponent of her teaching as it has come down to us from Apostolic days, and been proclaimed with one mouth in every section of the Apostolic family in every age. There is no more discordance in the tradition of the Church Catholic in respect of this principle than of God's existence."

It has been observed that I have made use of the first clause of our XXth Article—"The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies and authority in controversies of faith;" and in my Letter I appealed also to a well known Canon of 1571. The authority of both these Dr. Durbin has impeached, and, in his own opinion, has overthrown. It is my duty therefore to defend them. First, of the disputed clause of the Article. I remark then, that granting its spuriousness, nothing is gained; for the latter portion of the Article assumes the paramount right of the Church to expound

shall we do if we follow *universality, antiquity, consent.* Universality shall we follow thus, if we profess that one faith to be true which the whole Church throughout the world acknowledgeth and confesseth. Antiquity shall we follow if we depart not any whit from those senses which it is plain that our holy elders and fathers generally held. Consent shall we likewise follow, if in this very antiquity itself we hold the definitions and opinions of all or at any rate almost all the priests and doctors together."

Scripture and to "*enforce*" certain things "to be believed for necessity of salvation." Secondly, supposing the clause to have been originally an interpolation, it has become authoritative by the sanction of the Church. Before the Convocation of 1603, (as has been the case ever since) the Article, as it now stands, was received as one of the XXXIX Articles of 1562. So much then settles its present authority. Dr. Durbin's impeachment rests upon the following passage from Burnet.

"One alteration of more importance was made in the year 1571. These words of the XXth Article, *The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies and authority in controversies of faith*, were left out both in the manuscripts and in the printed editions, but were afterwards restored according to the Articles *printed* Anno 1563. I cannot find out in what year they were again put in the printed copies. They appear in two several impressions in Queen Elizabeth's time, which are in my hands. It passes commonly that it was done by Abp. Laud, and his enemies laid this upon him among other things, that he had corrupted the doctrine of this Church by this addition; but *he cleared himself of that* AS WELL HE MIGHT, and in a speech in the Star Chamber appealed to the orignal and affirmed these words were in it."

Of this passage I remark, that Burnet's assertion that the clause was left out "both in the manuscript and in the printed editions of 1571," is contradicted by authority that he himself produces. At his own request, the Master of C. C. College, Cambridge, made two collations; one of the "*Original MS.*" with the printed edition of 1563, and with the edition of 1553 of "King Edward's Articles;" the other collation was of the "*Original MS.*" of 1562, with the *MS.* and printed edition of 1571. Now as to Article XX, the results of this last collation are as follows, according to the record.*

"Art. 20. *MS.* The Church hath power to decree rites and ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith. And yet.

These words are not in the original MS.

MS. Ought it not to enforce any thing.

Pr. It ought not to enforce anything."

This collation then proves, that both the *MS.* of 1571, and the printed edition of 1571 contained the disputed clause; and that the same was not in the "*Original MS.*" of the XXXIX Articles, that is, of the year 1562, which every body knows. Burnet's statement therefore is only one instance, among many others,

* Burnet's Exposition, N. Y., 1843, p. 15.

of his heedlessness in reporting facts. With this agrees the account given by Dr. Cardwell in his Synodalia, (p. 34, note.) The original MS. (*i. e.* of 1562,) was laid before the Queen but did not receive her sanction. But a year afterwards the articles were printed by her command, with the declaration, that they had her "royal approval." This was the "printed edition of 1563," to which Burnet refers; and this edition differs from the "Original MS." of 1562, in having the disputed clause, and in excluding the XXIXth Article.

There can be little doubt therefore that this clause was originally inserted by the Queen and Privy Council, to whom a right of interference in such matters was then conceded. However, no matter who was the author, it afterwards received the sanction of the Church, and it appeared in the printed editions of 1563, 1571, 1581, 1586, 1593, 1612, 1624, 1628, 1629, 1630, 1631, and others that are all in the Bodleian Library. There were also two editions, one Latin, the other English, published in 1571, and agreeing with the *Original MS.* of 1562.

As to the calumny against Abp. Laud, that is refuted by the passage which Dr. Durbin cites. Burnet says, "he cleared himself of that, *as well he might*, and in a speech in the Star Chamber appealed to the original, and affirmed these words were in it." And yet in the face of this he says "in the judgment of charity (!) [Dr. Durbin's charity?] it may be concluded as it was commonly in Bishop Burnet's time, that the passage was foisted into the Article by Abp. Laud, for the purpose of bringing back the Church to Rome."

> O Judgment, thou art fled to brutish beasts;
> And men have lost their reason!

How could archbishop Laud have "foisted those words into the article," when, as even Burnet says, "they appeared in two several impressions in Queen Elizabeth's time which were in his hands"—that is before Laud was born, or while he was a boy? This stale, oft-repeated and as often-refuted Puritan calumny may now surely be consigned to the "tomb of the Capulets," there to rest in fit companionship with the "Nag's head" fable of the Jesuits.

I proceed to consider the Canon of 1571. Dr. Durbin says, I

knew this had never been of authority in the church. I reply, I did not know it, neither do I now. It is authority; the authority of the church. It is her voice, her command—published under the hand and seal of all the Bishops of England, at the time; and it has never been recalled, modified, or explained away. Nor could the church have abrogated it, without passing sentence of condemnation against herself, her creeds, liturgy, and homilies; without a departure from those principles on which she justified her Reformotion. But why were not the Canons of 1571 accompanied by the royal sign-manual? Because the Queen had objection to that paragraph, which I quoted, and which with all the rest was approved and signed by such men as Grindal and Jewell? The idea is supremely absurd, as every one who remembers the stern unbending front, with which Elizabeth met the Puritans and their measures for further reformation, must perceive at once. Dr. Cardwell in his Synodalia, gives some passages from Strype's life of Parker which go far towards solving the difficulty.

"The Archbishop laboured to get the Queen's allowance to it, (i. e. the book of Canons) but had it not: she, often declining to give her license to their orders and constitutions, reckoning that her bishops' power and jurisdiction *alone*, having their authority derived from her,* was sufficient. In the month of July or August the Archbishop sent this book to Grindal, Archbishop of York, recommending it to the observation of the Clergy of his province; and for his judgment of it.

"What that Archbishop's thoughts of it were is worth observing; which appears from his answer he sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as follows: 'He thanked his grace for the book of articles and discipline, but he stood in doubt whether they had *vigorem legis* unless they had been concluded upon in synod, and after ratified by her majesty's royal assent in scriptis (fine words, added he, fly away as wind, and will not serve us, if we were impleaded in a case of præmunire;) or else were confirmed by act of parliament. He said he liked the book very well; and that if hereafter he should doubt in any point, or wish it enlarged in any respect, he would signify to his grace hereafter. And *if* there were at present want of sufficient authority, yet it was well the book was ready and might receive more authority at the next parliament:' yet we see he and his provincial bishops signed it.

"But notwithstanding these doubts and suspicions which did not without reason arise in the minds of these and other of the bishops, (knowing what watchful back-friends they had) *yet they proceeded according to the above book of discipline, especially* in what concerned their *clergy* in their respective dioceses."

* Strype's Erastianism commits nobody but himself.

The Canon in question, let it be observed, "concerned their Clergy." Its title is *Concionatores.*

Elizabeth's conduct in this matter (of her motives presently) receives illustration from the manner in which she acted towards another book of discipline, (the *libellus admonitionum*) whose authority is assumed in the canons of 1571, in the canon prescribing the duties, &c., of Church wardens (*Aeditui*). Of this book Dr. Cardwell remarks, "The celebrated Advertisements of 1564, which, acting on the same principles as in the case of these canons the Queen refused *to put forth with her sanction,* although she had required the bishops in commission to draw them up, and afterwards insisted that they should be rigorously enforced. *By this* and by *other synods,* they seem to have been considered as having *the most perfect authority.*"

And yet they had not the ratification of the Queen's signature, no more than the canons of 1571. The two codes of discipline stand exactly upon the same ground.

It is not difficult to discover Elizabeth's motives. A new order of things had just been introduced; principles were not established; confusion reigned in the Church, and necessity in certain cases took the place of precedent and law. Elizabeth's Catholic predilections are well known; she stood between the Parliament and the Church, firmly checking the encroachments of the former upon the prerogatives of the latter. They had enacted that she was the supreme temporal head of the Church, and she acted upon their statute, to foil parliamentary interference; while she, at the same time, showed her anxiety to have the Church governed solely by Episcopal authority, in not obtruding her sanctions upon the canons of discipline enacted by the Convocation or the Bishops. Accordingly, when in 1562 the Commons interfered with the Church, by passing a bill ratifying the XXXIX Articles, and then sent their bill up to the Lords; she stopped its progress before it had passed to the second reading, considering it, as she said, (for it was all she could say *to Parliament*) an encroachment upon her prerogative as supreme head of the Church. Again, when in 1571 the Commons made a similar effort, the following message was sent from the Lords to the Commons, "that the Queen's majesty having been made privy to the said

Articles, liketh very well of them and mindeth to publish them, and have them executed *by the Bishops*, by direction of her highness' regal authority of supremacy of the Church of England, and *not to have the same dealt in by Parliament.*" And on the other hand, as we have seen, the Advertisements of 1564 were enforced, under her command, solely by the authority of the Church; and in like manner the Canons of 1571.

These Canons have, moreover, ever since been esteemed as authority, except by those persons who, agreeing with the infidel Hobbes, suppose that the State is the Church, the "public authority to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard," (spoken of in Art. 23) "the authority of the State,"* and the Bishops and Clergy, officials of the sovereign rather than Priests of the Most High God. I was not therefore following Dr. Pusey, as Dr. Durbin with characteristic cleverness insinuates, when I appealed to the Canon in question. It was not he, who led me to cite it, but the noble, learned, and saint-like Beveridge, who died more than a century ago. It was the use he had made of it in one of his sermons on the Church, which first impressed my mind with its authority and forceful meaning. His words are full of wisdom.

"Especially it concerns us who are to instruct others in the way to bliss, to use none but sound words, such as are consonant to the Scriptures, *as interpreted by the Catholic Church in all ages.* I speak not this of myself; it is *the express command* of our Church in the Canons she put forth in the year 1571, where she hath these words: *Imprimis vero videbunt* ('*Concionatores,*') &c., &c. ['But the preachers shall in the first place see to it that they never teach anything in the pulpit which they may wish to be religiously held and believed by the people, except what is agreeable to the doctrines of the Old and New Testament, and what the catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected out of that very doctrine.'] So wisely hath our Church provided against novelties; insomuch that had this one rule been duly observed as it ought there would have been no such thing as heresy or schism amongst us; but we should all have continued firm both to the doctrine and discipline of the Universal Church, and so should have held fast the form of sound words, according to the Apostles' counsel."†

So much for the authority of the Canon of 1571; now for my alleged use of it: I am asked—

* Durbin's Observations in Europe, vol. 2, p. 80, note. Has Dr. Durbin ever read the Preface to the Ordinal?

† Beveridge's Sermons in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, Sermon VI.

"How could you venture to produce this Canon in support of one of the capital errors of Popery, and this too when it was not designed to favour your interpretation, *but exactly the contrary*, as would have appeared to your reader had you quoted the whole of it, instead of quoting only so much as Dr. Pusey had produced in his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford? The latter part of the Canon reads thus: 'They [preachers] shall not teach vain and senseless opinions, and heresies, and Popish errors,'* and this too at a time when Popish errors as now were rife in the Church of England?"

The amazing imbecility of this passage will save Dr. Durbin from the retort it invites. My only answer therefore is, that I did not quote the Canon in support of one of the capital errors of "Popery," but to exhibit a fundamental principle of the Church of England. Dr. Durbin, it seems, has not the ability to perceive that *because* the Canon charges the clergy not to preach vain and senseless opinions and Popish errors, and also, not to preach any thing at any time, (*ne quid unquam*) but that which is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testaments, and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected out of that very doctrine; therefore, what the Catholic Fathers taught as Scriptural doctrine, is *not* "popish error;" following such traditional teaching in obedience to the Canon is *not* "a capital error of popery." I gave it no other interpretation than that which every body gives it; which every body must give it; which even Dr. Durbin gives it, in trying to impeach its authority. The sum of my remarks was as follows:

"You must therefore perceive, Rev. Sir, that obedience on the part of Anglican divines to the Canon of their Church is not to act inconsistently with the VIth Article. A recognition of the 'authority of the Church in controversies of faith,' submission to what she 'enforces to be believed' as Scriptural truth, (Art. XX.) preaching only what the catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected out of Scripture does not deny but rather maintains that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation."

II. I now proceed to substantiate the ground I maintained in

* Why did not Dr. Durbin proceed with what he puts forth as *his* quotation, and give what immediately follows as a contrast to "Popish errors," "*nec omnino quicquam*," &c. &c. *i. e.*, "Nor anything whatever whereby the ignorant multitude may be incited to a fondness for *novelty*," &c. "Popery" was no *novelty*, but Puritanism then was *the* novelty of the day. Perhaps Dr. D. quoted from his "Confutation of Puseyism," which would explain all this *and more besides.*

my Letter, on the means of Justification; not that my position needs any strengthening at all, but simply for the sake of developing the proofs I there advanced, that minds which have been sophisticated by sectarian dogmas may be able, if possible, to see what is the Church's doctrine, and that it stands utterly opposed to the teaching of Methodism.

Dr. Durbin begins his remarks on this subject in his usual *ad captandum* style; he places our XIth Article side by side with his own, and then bravely asks, "are they not identical?" To be sure they are in their letter (except that ours confesses itself to be an incomplete statement, which his does not), and I never had the stupidity to deny it. I discussed no such point as this, but rather that his interpretation of the words "faith only," so as to exclude not merely our own merits, but also all sacramental media, whereby, solely for Christ's sake, and not for our works, justification is given to faith; gives a meaning to our Article which neither its own text, nor Holy Writ, nor the Homily, nor our Church's teaching elsewhere will warrant. All this I shall prove as I proceed.

I stated as an undeniable fact, that the Article raised but one point, viz. the ground or procuring cause (*propter quod*) of man's justification; to wit, the merits of Christ in opposition to our own works or deservings. A man half blind can see this on reading the English of the Article, but for the sake of those whose vision is yet more obscure, I shall cite the Latin version (which is the original draft) where the order of the words indicates the emphasis: "Tantum *propter* meritum Domini ac Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi, per fidem, non *propter* opera, et merita nostra, justi coram Deo reputamur. *Quare* sola fide nos justificari," &c.; that is literally and in the same order, "Only *for the sake of* the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by faith, and not *for the sake of* our works and merits, are we reputed just before God. *Wherefore* that we are justified only by faith is a doctrine most wholesome and full of comfort, as in the Homily concerning the justification of man is more largely unfolded." The last sentence of the Article is introduced by "*wherefore*," and consequently it is a conclusion deduced from what goes before, thus

showing that the words "we are justified only by faith," means nothing more and nothing less than this, that "we are reputed just *only for the sake* of the merit of our Lord, by faith, and *not for the sake* of our works and merits. So much for the text of the Article. But to put our Church's meaning of the words "faith only," beyond dispute, I referred as the Article directs, to the Homily, where the doctrine is more largely expressed, in order to obtain its decisive judgment. In making this reference, the opportunity occurred of giving an example of the Church's use of her own prescribed rule of teaching, and accordingly I said, "that Homily professes to deliver the doctrine as it had always been received by the Fathers and Doctors of the Church Catholic," which shows ours is not the Lutheran doctrine. To prove this assertion I quoted the words, "And after this manner to be justified only by this true and lively faith, speak all the old and ancient authors, both Greeks and Latins." Hereupon Dr. Durbin tries his skill in the construction of scare-crows, and proceeds to solicit the shame and grief of all good men for me, because I omitted the words "in Christ," after the word "faith"—the merest accident, caused by my hastily following the usual elliptical phrase, "justification by faith," wherein the Object of faith is always understood and always omitted.* I do not believe there are any good men so stupid as to feel any shame at all on my account, though it is possible they may have some pity for Dr. Durbin, for that he should say that I made this omission "to lead the reader to the conclusion, that the faith was to be had in Sacraments!" I take it upon me to say that a more preposterous idea never entered into the mind of man. There never was a man who believed that he was justified by faith in the Sacraments; and before Dr. Durbin arose, there never was a man who believed there was any such nonsense possible. But this is not all: he says that I "very carefully suppressed the quotations which the Homily gives from Hilary Basil and Ambrose." Ex-

* I hope I shall not be charged with wilfully "causing shame and grief to all good men" if I point to a similar oversight in the translation of our IXth Article. It reads, "And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized," &c. The Latin is, "Et quanquam renatis et credentibus nulla propter Christum est condemnatio;" i. e. literally, "And although *for Christ's sake*, there is no condemnation to them that are regenerate and believe."

cellent! And that when the passages from those Fathers simply occupy the ground of the Article as I have interpreted it, viz. opposing Christ's righteousness to man's; His merits to our works. I did not cite these passages, because I had no occasion whatever to quote the words of those saints. I referred to the homily for the purpose of adducing *its words* alone; and whatever the words of those Fathers may have been, the homily said, (which was enough for me) that such and such was their *meaning*, which is also the meaning of the homily. They said no more nor less than this:—

"This saying that we are justified by faith only, freely and without works, *is spoken* [i. e. by the fathers] for to take away clearly all merit of our works as being unable to *deserve* our justification .... and therefore wholly to ascribe the merit and deserving of our justification unto Christ only and His most precious blood-shedding."

Dr. Durbin seems very indignant that I should imagine that he and others who agree with him cannot, in their present circumstances, distinctly apprehend the doctrines of the Church. But a more signal proof of the truth of my assertion there could not be than the remarks he has made, and the quotations he has adduced upon the subject of justification. It was no matter with him that I maintained the doctrine of "justification by faith only" in as strong terms as the Article; that I said that faith* is the sole means, the sole grace which qualified us for a participation of the merits of our Lord; that according to the homily "faith only" is an exclusion of personal merit in the sinner, and of course of his works, from being the procuring cause (*propter quod*) of his justification; and an ascription of all *desert* to our Lord and His Cross—no, all this amounts to nothing in Dr. Dur-

* The *kind* of faith here meant, I explained by this passage of the Homily: "Nevertheless, this sentence that we be justified by faith only is not so meant of them, (i. e. the Fathers) that the said justifying faith is *alone* in man, without true repentance, hope, charity, dread, and the fear of God at any time and seasons." That is, it is not bare faith, but what the Church writers call "*fides formata charitate*,"—and St. Paul, "faith which worketh by love." So also St. James: "Seest thou how faith wrought with his works, and *by works was his faith made perfect*." Ch. ii. 22. "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified and not by faith only," v. 24. Yet St. James is far from saying that works *deserve* our justification, or that justification is any thing else than a gift of God's free mercy, imparted to us, "*only* for the sake of the merits" of our Lord.

bin's eyes. He reiterates against me quotations from the Homilies, dressed up in capitals and italics, which prove just what I have said, that we are "justified freely without works, by faith only;" thus giving his reader the idea that, so far from maintaining, I had denied that cardinal proposition. Such is the confusion which reigns in his mind on this subject, that although every passage he quotes opposes faith to works and personal merit, and to *nothing else;* yet he cannot divest himself of the notion, that by the XIth Article, "faith only" is opposed also to the life-giving grace of the Sacraments. What is the consequence? Why the marvellous, the profane absurdity, of placing God's gift of the new birth in Jesus Christ, and the Body and Blood, the indwelling of the Incarnate Word, in the same category with our works and personal virtues, our "repentance, hope, love, fear and dread of God!" Accordingly, all his efforts go to prove that the Church in teaching "justification by faith only" means not simply "without our works or deservings," but also "by faith without *regeneration*," "by faith without the *indwelling and quickening spirit* of the Second Adam," the "Word made flesh:" for these are the gifts conveyed by the Sacraments. Such is the consequence of Dr. Durbin's reasoning, if reasoning it may be called. It matters not that *he* does not believe there is any such grace given by Sacraments; it matters not that the Sacraments, so to speak, of his Society, are, consistently with his religious theory, *man's* works and not God's, and *therefore* are, agreeably to his Article, excluded from the means of justification, as being properly opposed to faith;—the Church teaches very differently of her Sacraments, and he knows it; and in quoting the language of the Church, he should, by all that is due to justice and truth, interpret it according to her usage, and not by the principles of Methodism.

After I had thus proved that the Homily, by the words "faith only" simply meant to shut out personal merit in the sinner, and not God's gifts from the means of justification (an absurdity which, as I have shown, would be equivalent to saying, that we are justifiable by faith only without the grace of justification); and had adverted also to the fact that *that* doctrine of "justification by faith only" which has always been received in the Church

Catholic, was the doctrine which the Homily professed to teach —I asked in my Letter,

"What authority, therefore, has any one for saying that our XIth Article excludes the Sacraments from being God's means and instruments for conveying justifying grace to the penitent believer? Was not the Sacramental system maintained in its fullest vigor by all those Catholic Fathers to whom the Homily appeals (from Origen to SS. Anselm and Bernard*) as having taught justification by faith only? This of course is undeniable; and therefore quite consistently does the same Homily recognize the Sacraments† as instrumental means of justification. (See also Art. XXVII.) It says, "Infants being *baptized* are by this sacrifice (i. e. of the Cross) *washed* from their sins [brought to God's *favour* and made His *children* and inheritors of His kingdom. And they which in act or deed, do sin after Baptism, when they turn again to God unfeignedly, they are *likewise* (i. e. *as* formerly by Baptism, *so* now Sacramentally) washed by this sacrifice from their sins‡]; and again, "our office is not to pass the time of this present life unfruitfully or idly, after that we are baptized *or* justified, much less after that we be made Christ's *members* to live contrary to the same, making ourselves members of the devil."

Of this passage Dr. Durbin remarks,

"I have carefully examined and compared the Homily with your views of it, and *extracts* from it, and I confess that I feel sorrow (?) at what you have done. You have endeavoured to sustain your doctrine of *Sacramental* justification by this Homily; *when it does not make even an indirect allusion to that doctrine.* If the Homily make such an allusion, I challenge you to show where and in what."

Brave words! The reader who remembers, that in the passages just quoted from the Homily, and which were "*carefully examined,*" it is said that infants *baptized* are, by the sacrifice of the Cross, washed from their sins, brought into God's favour, made His children and inheritors of His kingdom; that "our office is not to pass the time of this present life idly after that we are baptized *or justified* (where baptism and justification are interchangeable equivalents for the same thing); will perhaps be led to doubt whether Dr. Durbin knows that Baptism is a *Sacrament.*

The reason is now apparent why it was that I said I could not

* i. e. down to the 12th century.

† If one Sacrament be recognized, the other is also; for they both convey similar though not altogether the same gifts. By one we are made members of Christ, and by the other he dwells in us; and both are for the remission of sins.

‡ This passage in brackets was for the sake of brevity omitted in my Letter. The explanation I give in the parenthesis is justified as well by the laws of grammar as by the prayer in the Communion office; "Grant us therefore so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son, and to drink His blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls *washed* through His most precious Blood," &c.

treat of the Church's doctrine of justification without taking into view the Sacraments; especially when I was obliged to consider that doctrine relatively to what the Methodists maintained. And herein I shall prove that I was moving directly in the line marked out for me as well by the Church as Holy Scripture.

Is the remission of sins an element of justification? All agree that it is, and some maintain that that is all. It is an Article of the Creed, "I acknowledge one Baptism *for* the the remission of sins." In our Baptismal office we pray for the Candidate that he coming to Holy baptism, may receive remission of sin by *spiritual regeneration.* After he is baptized the minister says, "seeing now dearly beloved that this person *is regenerate* and grafted into the body of Christ's Church, let us give thanks," &c. So too the Homilies besides the passages already quoted: "Yea we be therefore washed in *baptism* from the filthinesss of sin, that we should live afterwards in pureness of life." 2 B. 13, pt. 1. So too St. Peter, in the first sermon ever preached in the Church: "Repent and be *baptized* in the name of Jesus Christ *for the remission of sins,* and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." And such also was the express word of Ananias to penitent Saul, "Arise and be *baptized* and *wash away thy sins.*" Again, are we justified by being taken out of the world and from our condemned relationship with the old Adam, and translated into God's kingdom, and made members of Christ by the Holy Ghost? See the Baptismal service every where. And the Catechism: "in *Baptism* wherein I was made a member of Christ, the child of God, and an inheritor of the Kingdom of Heaven." So too the Homily; "by holy promises we be made lively members of Christ when we profess His religion, receiving the Sacrament of Baptism." 1 B. 7. And as before, "Infants being baptized .... are brought into God's favour, made His children and inheritors of His kingdom in Heaven." So St. Paul; "ye are all *children* of God by faith in Christ Jesus, *for* as many of you as have been *baptized* into Christ have put on Christ;" and again, "ye are *washed,* ye are *sanctified,* ye are *justified* in the name of the Lord Jesus, and *by* the Spirit of our God;" and again, "By one Spirit are we all *baptized* into one Body." Is a participation of the meritorious death and resurrection of our Lord, justification? See

the Baptismal Office, where, in the thanksgiving for the grace the person has just received in the Sacrament, it is said, "We beseech thee to grant that he *being dead* unto sin, and *living* unto righteousness, may crucify the old man, and utterly abolish the whole body of sin." So also the Catechism says, "the inward grace received in Holy Baptism, is a death unto sin and a new birth unto *righteousness.*" And St. Paul: "Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ *were baptized into his death?* Therefore we are buried with Him, by baptism into death, that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." (Rom. vi. 3, 4; and (in verse 7,) speaking of those who are thus dead unto sin, he says, "for he that is dead is justified from sin." In a word, is justification that unspeakable saving gift of God which is bestowed upon us, not for our works of righteousnes, but of His mercy through Christ our Lord? Hear then St. Paul; "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to His mercy, He *saved* us by the *washing* (διὰ λουτρου, *by means* of the *laver,* or font) of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that being *justified* by His grace we might be made heirs of eternal life."

Dr. Durbin asks:

"How could you dare to say that these same Fathers [from Origen to St. Bernard] taught the 'Sacramental system,' and 'therefore the Homily consistently recognizes the Sacraments as instrumental means of justification?' The Homily says they taught the doctrine of 'Sacramental justification.' Both cannot be true."

Both *are true;* and the evidence I have just adduced both from our Church's standards and Holy Scripture, proves it, *demonstrates* it. Was not St. Paul justified by faith only?* And were not his sins washed away by baptism? Were not the converts on the great feast of Pentecost justified by faith only? And were they not baptized for the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost? But it is true that neither St. Paul nor St. Peter, nor the Fathers knew any thing of such a doctrine as that taught by the Methodists; of which Dr. Durbin rightly judges that *it*

* i. e. our Church explains the formula, "*only* for the sake of our Lord Jesus Christ *by faith,* and not for the sake of our own works or merits."

cannot be true, if the Sacraments be means of justification, as I have shown them to be. And accordingly the Methodists never hear their religious teachers announce the doctrine and gospel of the Apostles. Did a Methodist ever exhort anybody to be *baptized for the remission of his sins* and the gift of the Holy Ghost? Never! Did a Methodist ever deliver such a message as that of Ananias to Saul, "be baptized and wash away thy sins?" Never! such doctrine never escapes their lips. Their teachers are not able to enunciate such truth, for if they did it would overthrow their whole system. They have a mode of proceeding totally different, one too unknown to the Apostles, to the Fathers, and to the Church of Christ. They ask the astounding question, "Have you *experienced* the pardon of sin!" And they thus make their *feeling*, that which *is their own*, take the place of the Holy Sacraments which our Lord has made the witnesses and seals and pledges of the grace He bestows. Was a Methodist ever told that the reason why he should not sin is, that by his *baptism* he was baptized into Christ's death? Never! such awful conclusions from the wonderful mystery of Holy Baptism as are to be seen in the sixth chapter of Romans, are never heard from a Methodist pulpit, nor seen written in their books. The *Lutheran dogma of justification* virtually blots out from their Bibles the doctrine of the Apostles, and veils from their eye-sight the teaching inspired by the Holy Ghost. "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear!"

Let it not be supposed that a participation of such unspeakable grace as the Church teaches is conveyed by Sacraments, will *ipso facto* save a man. Minds filled with Lutheran and Calvinistic notions are accustomed to draw this conclusion; but this only shows their inability, while their minds are thus sophisticated, to apprehend the doctrine of the Church. They take one premiss from the Catholic system, and the other from their own; and the monstrous hybrid offspring of such an argument, they try to father on the Church. Nevertheless, our doctrine is most simple, and adapted to the minds of little children; but at the same time the capacity of a Newton may fail to apprehend it. It is a law of the Kingdom of Heaven, that its mysteries are hid from the wise and prudent, and revealed unto babes. "Even so Father! for so

it seemed good in thy sight." The parables of our Lord illustrate the Gospel of the Kingdom of Heaven. The soul of each child of Adam on passing from the world into the Communion of Saints is a well filled and lighted lamp, which it is his glorious calling to keep filled, and trimmed, and burning, till the Bridegroom's coming. And this can he do, and will he do, if he be "wise." But if he be "foolish" and improve not his privileges in the Kingdom of Heaven, and so suffer his lamp to go out, the glorious coming of the Bridegroom will bring him nothing but woe. He will not only lose all he had, but besides that he will be punished for losing it. The gift of Holy Baptism thus becomes the basis of all the Christian's responsibilities. Their foundation is GRACE. The Jew could look no farther than the Law, for the ground of moral obligation; nor the heathen beyond the law of nature. But St. Paul says to those "baptized into Christ," "Ye are not under the Law, but under grace;" "yield yourselves unto God, *as those that are alive from the dead*, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." Work out your own salvation with fear and trembling, *for* it is God who worketh in you to will and to do of His good pleasure; and again, "in Baptism *wherein* we *are risen* with Him . . . if ye then be risen with Christ—seek those things which are above."

The harmony between the facts that we are justified by faith only and at the same time by the grace given in Sacraments, (because the grace thus given is the reward vouchsafed to faith) it is to be hoped, may now be distinctly seen. And therefore, I shall bring the discussion of this matter to a close, with an illustration afforded by the Gospels. I refer to the case of the woman who was cured of an issue of blood by touching the border of our Lord's garment. "Jesus said, somebody hath touched me, for I perceive that *virtue* is gone out of me." . . . And He said to the woman, "Daughter, be of good comfort, *thy faith* hath made thee whole." Now I put the question to those who say that "we cannot be justified or saved by faith only, and by the Sacraments also;" was it the "virtue" which flowed out of our Lord's Person *through* the border of His garment, or was it the woman's faith, that made her whole? Is one opposed to the other? Are not both true? Assuredly they are. So also is it

in the salvation of man. The Person of our Lord, God and Man, is the source of that life and grace which regenerates, renews, justifies, and sanctifies us; and which at the last day will quicken our mortal bodies into life again, and make them like His own glorious Body. "His life is the well-spring and cause of ours." "He that hath the Son hath life." The living branches of the True Vine partake of its sap and verdure; the members of His Body share in His fulness. "In Him dwelleth all the *fulness* of the Godhead *bodily*, and ye are *complete* (πεπληρωμενοι made full) in Him who is the Head, buried with Him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with Him, through the faith of God's operation." The Sacraments instituted by Himself are to us, what His garment was to the woman. He is hid in them. They are the means and channels through which His life-giving grace flows into us; and faith as with the woman, is that which makes man susceptible of this grace, the subjective means of partaking of it, as the Sacraments are the objective means of conveying it. Or in the words of the great Hooker, "that saving grace which Christ originally is or hath for His people, *by Sacraments* He severally deriveth into every member thereof. Sacraments serve as the instruments of God to that end and purpose." . . . . "We receive Christ Jesus in Baptism once as the first beginner, in the Eucharist often being by continual degrees the finisher of our life."

I wish that I might here take leave of this subject. It is exceedingly irksome to be obliged again to go over the ground which I occupied in my Letter to Dr. Durbin, in order to prove that Methodism is at utter variance with the Church on this fundamental point; which, as I am happy to acknowledge, he agrees with me in saying, decides every thing in controversy. I thought I had brought the matter to the crucial test, when I cited our Article "Of sin after Baptism" as having been entitled by the Methodists, (in order to make it suit their religion) "Of Sin after Justification." And here a theologian would have seen that the question was settled by the documentary evidence furnished by the Methodists on the one hand, and by our Church on the other. What are the words of that Article? As Dr. Durbin is fond of seeing our respective Articles printed side by side, I may as well gratify him here.

OF SIN AFTER BAPTISM.	OF SIN AFTER JUSTIFICATION.
Not every deadly sin (*Non omne peccatum mortale*) willingly committed after Baptism, is sin against the Holy Ghost and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. *After we have received the Holy Ghost*, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin, and by the grace of God (we may) arise again and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned, which say, they can no more sin as long as they live here, or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.	Not every sin willingly committed after Justification is the sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable. Wherefore the grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Justification; after we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given and fall into sin, and by the grace of God rise again and amend our lives. And therefore they are to be condemned who say they can no more sin as long as they live here; or deny the place of forgiveness to such as truly repent.

The variations in the text of the Methodist Article, other than the change of the word "Baptism" to "Justification," however significant, do not interfere with the argument I deduce from its title. It is plain, that language which our Church adopts in respect to Baptism, the Methodists cannot use without applying it to their doctrine of justification; thus denying for themselves, that justification is the grace of Baptism, and asserting that the Church teaches, that it is the same. Very consistently does Dr. Durbin assert, that these are "two totally distinct points, and so expressly declared in the titles of the two Articles." But who made them distinct? That is the question. That they are distinct in his system, was the fact that I cited the Articles to prove; and that very distinction shows the opposition that exists between Methodism and the Church on this fundamental point. And yet he strangely says, after many words of no importance, about my not meeting the question "directly and frankly," "subterfuge and vacillation," "false issues," (!) "adroit substitutions," and the like:

> "All that you have said, therefore, of the inconsistency of Methodism touching the Sacrament of Baptism falls to the ground; *for* it is predicated of our Article *Of Sin after Justification*, and not of our Article *Of Baptism* nor of our baptismal service, both of which are taken from the Church of England. But the whole of these injurious blunders arise from"

Dr. Durbin's own brain. As to what he says, of my not taking into view his baptismal service, I beg to refer, in contradicting his

assertion, to pp. 16, 17, 18, of my Letter, where I pointed out and proved from his baptismal service, its doctrinal variation from our own. And as to his article *Of Baptism*, I did not refer to that, simply because I thought that after a point was once proved, nothing more need be said about it. It seems however, that I set too high an estimate upon his theological discernment, and therefore to accommodate him, I suppose I must, even at the risk of taxing the reader's patience, refer to his Article of Baptism. But let us first fix our eyes upon the point whence the broad line of division is here drawn, that so we may follow it up continuously. On reference to the Article *Of Sin after Baptism*, quoted above, it will be seen that it distinctly recognizes the doctrine of spiritual regeneration, and of justification, in Baptism. Its words are, "after we have received the Holy Ghost we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin;" this being equivalent to saying, that "after Baptism we may depart from grace given," &c. It is this doctrine of Regeneration which the Methodists do not hold; and as it is this which makes the great difference between sins before, and sins after Baptism, the Methodists do not, and while they are Methodists they cannot recognize any difference between such sins; nor correspondingly, any difference between works performed before, and after Baptism.* The Methodist Article of Baptism will show the same doctrinal variation; that is, that they do not agree with the Church as to what that Sacrament is, and of what it is the means.

ART. XXVII. OF BAPTISM.	THE METHODIST ARTICLE. OF BAPTISM.
Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but is also a sign of Regeneration or New Birth, WHEREBY as by an instrument, they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the	Baptism is not only a sign of profession and mark of difference whereby Christians are distinguished from others that are not baptized; but it is also a sign of regeneration or new birth. The Baptism of young children is to be retained in the Church.

* For the Church's doctrine of the efficacy of *Christian* works, the XIth Homily of the second Book, entitled, *Of Alms-Deeds*, may be advantageously consulted. The doctrine there stated at length is very different from what is now commonly received; but as this is a point which does not enter into my present subject I pass it by. It should be remembered that *Bp. Jewell* had a great hand in setting forth the 2nd Book of Homilies, which the Articles also seem to prefer to the first Book.

Church; the promises of the forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be Sons of God, (*in filios Dei, among* the sons of God) are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of Prayer unto God. The Baptism of young children is in anywise to be retained in the Church as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.

Let the reader mark the spot where the Methodists have stopped short, in trying to follow our Article; it is at the very point where the Church goes on to say what Baptism is the means of. And this omission coincides with their doctrine that persons are admitted into the Church, not by Baptism, as the Apostles taught, but by "joining class." So speaks the "Discipline:" "Let none be received *into the church*, until they are recommended by a leader with whom they have met at least six months on trial, and *have been* baptized;" &c. So we learn what Methodists mean, when they talk so loudly about the Bible, as their "*only* rule of faith and practice;" they intend very innocently to say, that "they follow the *Book of Discipline* instead."

A comparison of the Articles on the all important doctrine of Original sin (on which if a man err, he errs throughout the whole plan of salvation by Christ) will reveal the same point of departure from the faith, and very much else which it is beside my present purpose to notice.

ARTICLE IX.

Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the *Pelagians* do vainly talk;) but it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is engendered of the offspring of *Adam*, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the flesh lusteth always contrary to the spirit; and therefore, in every person born into this world it deserveth God's wrath and damnation. And this infection of nature doth remain, yea, in them that are regenerated; whereby the lust of the flesh called in

METHODIST ARTICLE.

Original sin standeth not in the following of Adam, (as the Pelagians do vainly talk,) but it is the corruption of the nature of every man, that naturally is engendered of the offspring of Adam, whereby man is very far gone from original righteousness, and is of his own nature inclined to evil, and that continually.

Greek φρόνημα σαρκὸς which some do expound the wisdom, some sensuality, some the affection, some the desire of the flesh, is not subject to the Law of God. And although there is no condemnation for them that believe and are baptized; yet the Apostle doth confess that concupiscence and lust hath of itself the nature of sin.

The Church's doctrine of regeneration is recognized in this Article, as indeed it must always be where the doctrine of original sin is fully stated. But the Methodists have omitted that very portion which speaks of regeneration. The words, "to them who believe and are bapitzed," are the equivalents to these from the Latin version: "*renatis et credentibus*," literally, "to the regenerated and believers." But notwithstanding all this documetary evidence, Dr. Durbin has the extraordinary boldness to assert, that the doctrine of Baptism is "the same in both Churches!" His proof is this, (and let the reader who has observed the difference in the two Articles of Baptism, mark it;) "Every word of our seventeenth Article of Baptism being taken from the English Article of Baptism." Is not this rare logic? With as much truth might he have said, that the Bible and the Nicene Symbol both teach the Creed of the Deist, because they both speak of "One God the Father Almighty."*

* The following amazing words are found on p. 7 of Dr. Durbin's Letter. He is speaking of his "Christian Communion of more than a million of members," and says to me, it "derived its ordination [see Appendix B.] Articles of Religion, and Sacramental services from the *same source* as your own and in the same language. I say *in the same language*, notwithstanding you have by a careful collation, found verbal alterations (?) in two or three instances (!)" Again, in a note he goes on in the same reckless style: "The differences between the Articles and Services which the Methodist Episcopal Church has taken from the Church of England, and those of the Church are scarcely greater in reality than the differences between those of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Church of England. In both cases the differences have mainly arisen from circumstances, the occasional variation in the meaning of words, and the more settled sense affixed to the same. There is no essential difference in the fundamental doctrines of the three churches; examples of which"

The reader has seen to tell a story very different from that which Dr. Durbin would impose upon him. And here is somewhat more:

Besides the *doctrinal* variations in the Articles which have been noted in the text,

III. The third and last topic before me is the Holy Eucharist. I proceed then to establish, not by a reference to the opinions of individuals, but by an appeal to documentary evidence, as I have done all along, the fundamental opposition between Methodism

the Methodists have stricken out bodily the following doctrinal Articles of the Church of England, to wit, the 3d, *Of Christ's descent into Hell.* 8th, *Of the Creeds.* 15th, *Of Christ alone without sin,* in which the doctrine of regeneration appears. 17th, *Of Predestination and Election,* wherein the school of Tillotson and Burnet would be glad to follow them. 18th, *Of obtaining Eternal Salvation only by the name of Christ,* which bears hard upon Methodists, anathematizing those that "presume to say that every man shall be saved by the Law or Sect which he professeth." 23rd, *Of ministering in the Congregation* (*ecclesia*) which is also a condemnation of the Methodists and of Wesley's mock ordinations. 26th, *Of the unworthiness of Ministers, which hinders not the effect of the Sacraments,* wherein was scented something of the "*Opus Operatum.*" 29th, *Of the wicked which eat not the Body of Christ* [*in the use of the Lord's Supper*]: the words in brackets are not in the Latin title. In addition to all this they have changed the title and first words of 32d, *Of the marriage of Priests,* (*Sacerdotum*) which corresponds with their rejection of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. They have also altered the title of the 34th, "*Of the traditions of the Church,*" into "*Rights and Ceremonies of Churches,*" and the passage, "Whosoever through his private judgment, willingly and purposely, doth openly break *the traditions and ceremonies of the Church,*" into "the *rites* and ceremonies of the Church *to which he belongs.*" The Church of England knows of but one Church, "The one Catholic and Apostolic Church," and legitimate national branches of the same. See the title-page of the Book of Common Prayer. The Methodists consider all religious worshipping bodies, Churches, in the proper sense, because they call themselves "Churches." Schism is a sin which cannot coexist with their vaunted right of "private judgment." It is nevertheless denounced by the Apostles.*

Now all these repudiated Articles have been retained by the Church in this country. The only changes made in the English Articles, are, 1st, the striking out the name of the Athanasian Creed from Art. 8, because that Creed was, to our unspeakable regret thrown out of the Morning Service, on account of its damnatory clauses; and that, from the same mistaken tenderness which led our first informal Convention to publish a set of Articles which omitted all condemnation of Roman Errors: 2d, the 21st Article about "the authority of General councils," which, because of its local and civil nature, its words about "the will of Princes," it would have been improper to retain in this country. 3rd, We made a new Article "of the power of the civil magistrate," which was necessary, inasmuch as we had nothing to do with "the King's Majesty." This new Article omits saying anything of the Bishop of Rome. Our church does not decide where or where not he hath jurisdiction.

Our Baptismal Offices are identical with the English, but the Methodists

* See Appendix A.

and the Church on this vital point. I stated in my Letter that the Methodists rejected those two characteristics of that great Mystery, which the Church has always maintained, viz. "that it is an oblation to God the Father and a real and spiritual communication of Christ's Body and Blood to worthy receivers." The first, I went on to say, "is recognized in the prayer for the Church militant, previous to which the Priest is directed to place the alms and elements on the Altar; immediately after which God is besought to accept the alms *and* the oblations *and* prayers." Hereupon Dr. Durbin is pleased modestly to remark, not only that I have totally mistaken my own Church's doctrine of the Eucharist; but he adds further on,

"I know not whether to suppose your want of discernment or to doubt your candour, in your attempt to make the reader of your Letter believe that the oblation of the elements to God the Father is found in the prayer for the Church militant. There is not *one word* in that prayer *to countenance* it: but *expressly the contrary.*"

As I am not in the least concerned about his thoughts of my discernment, or his doubts of my candour, I shall proceed at once to establish my assertion by proof. Even Burnet,* who very naturally is quite a favourite with Dr. Durbin,

have essentially altered the same, as I have elsewhere shown. Our Liturgy of the Holy Communion varies from the English in containing a fuller expression of the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice; and in having the ancient Invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the Elements, in which feature it agrees with the Oriental and some other Liturgies, and differs from the English and Roman. The Methodist "Communion Service" is such a perfect monster of deformity, that I need say nothing else about it.

Now when one bears all these things in mind, and hears it said that the differences between the Articles and Services which the "Methodist Episcopal Church" has taken from the Church of England, and those of the Church, are scarcely greater *in reality* than the differences between those of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Church of England—one is seriously led to inquire what, in the eye and mind of Dr. Durbin, does constitute *a fact?*

* The Church never has been satisfied with Burnet's Exposition of the Articles. At the Convocation of 1700 the lower house thus expressed their opinion of it:

"Whereas a book hath been lately published, entitled, 'An exposition of the XXXIX Articles of the Church of England, by Gilbert, Lord Bishop of Sarum,'

(as is also the heretic Whately) with all his latitudinarian bias, and his low lifeless Arminianism, might have told him, that, besides the propriety of the Eucharist's being called a sacrifice in two senses which he names, "in two other respects it may be also more *strictly* called a *sacrifice.* One is *because there is an oblation of bread and wine made in it.*" (And in the English Liturgy of which Burnet is speaking, there is no other verbal oblation but that in the prayer for the Church.) "Another respect in which

which the author declares to have passed the perusal of both the Archbishops, and several Bishops and other learned divines, and suggests their approbation of it; and whereas we think it our duty as much as in us lies, to secure the doctrines contained in those Articles, from any attempts that may be made against them, we most humbly offer to your grace and your Lordships the sense of this house, which is as follows:

1. "That the said book tends to introduce such a latitude and diversity of opinions, as the Articles were framed to avoid.

2. "That there are many passages in the exposition of several Articles which appear to be contrary to the true meaning of them, and to other received doctrines of our Church.

3. "That there are some things in the said book which seem to us to be of dangerous consequence to the Church of England, as by law established, and to derogate from the honour of its reformation.

"All of which particulars we humbly lay before your Lordships, praying your opinion herein."—

This document however, of course was not acceptable to the Bishops, for reasons, which every one acquainted with the history of those times would be at no loss to imagine. See Cardwell's Synodalia, p. 704.

As to the present notorious Archbishop of Dublin (whose name on several accounts I have not unreasonably coupled with that of Burnet), his heresy is known as widely as his name. In the Appendix to his logic he has distinctly taught Sabellianism, thus considering our Blessed Lord little else than an abstraction; and in his sermons this heresy appears in a still more revolting form. Thus he says explicitly, (pp. 51, 52) "We differ from the worshippers of a graven image, or of a fire in this, the *essential* circumstance, that their worship is unauthorized, presumptuous, and vain, while ours is divinely appointed..... But the *kind* of adoration which idolators pay to their images *so far corresponds to the Christians' to our Lord Jesus Christ, that we might very reasonably and intelligibly describe Him by that term.*" See British Critic, No. 64, p. 396.

Dr. Durbin and others may rest assured that writers of this stamp give no "trouble" whatever to the Catholic-minded members of the Church, beyond the fact, which is indeed a solemn one, that they mourn over a church which is cursed with such a head.

the Eucharist is called a sacrifice is, that it is a commemoration and a *representation to God*, of the sacrifice that Christ offered for us on the cross." I do not, however, wish to refer to the authority of Bishop Burnet, on this or any other doctrine:

> Non tali auxilio nec defensoribus istis
> Tempus eget.

I have no occasion to look beyond the letter of our Church's own formularies. In the first place then, the prayer in question, like all other prayers in the Liturgy of the Holy Communion, is, in accordance with unvarying Catholic usage, addressed distinctly and intentionally to the First Person in the adorable Trinity; consequently, since the prayer does contain an oblation, the offering is made to God the Father. Secondly, as to what the word "oblations" refers to, I asserted, that it meant the sacramental elements on the altar; and in proof I bring the fact that the word "oblations" was inserted in that prayer, in addition to the word "alms," at the very time the following rubric was prefixed, "*And the Priest shall then place upon the table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient. After which he shall say** Let us pray," &c. Consequently, the intention of the rubric and the meaning of the word "oblations" are apparent each from the other. Thirdly, the custom of the Church in the use of the prayer, goes to establish the same. When the offertory is used without a communion, (which is obligatory every Sunday in England, though it is discretionary with us) the passage is read thus, "we beseech Thee most mercifully to accept these our alms, and receive these our prayers;" or, if it should so happen that no alms are collected at a communion, it is read "accept these our oblations;" or finally, if the prayer is used without the offertory, when "there are no alms or oblations," as it sometimes is, it is read, "We beseech thee to receive these our prayers."

When therefore Dr. Durbin goes on to say:

> "Now leaving out the words 'to accept our alms and oblations, and' when there are no alms or other devotions of the people to be offered to God, the elements alone remain,"

he is imagining a case which never exists. The word "ob-

* See Wheatly on the Common Prayer, ch. 6, § 10, III.

lations" never is omitted at a communion, and cannot be without a violation of the order of the Church.

The "devotions of the people," refer to the Minister's dues; and are properly coupled with the alms—both being required to be collected in a "decent basin." They are all one with the alms except as to their object. This part of the rubric has indeed no significance in the Church in this country, but was once observed in England. Wheatly says of it:—

"It was with an eye I suppose to this difference [that is, among the offertory sentences, some of which refer to the poor, and some to the minister of the altar] that in the last review there was a distinction made in the rubric that follow these sentences, between *alms for the poor* and other devotions of the people. In the old common prayer there was only mention made of the latter of these, as appears from its being ordered to be put into the poor man's box. But then the clergy were included in other words which ordered that upon the offering days appointed *every man and woman should pay to the curate the due and accustomed offerings*. . . . Now indeed whilst they have a stated and legal income, the money collected at those times is generally appropriated to the poor, not but that where the stated income of the parish is not sufficient to maintain the clergy, they have still a right to claim their share in these offerings."

I asserted also that "this oblation of the elements was repeated in the prayer of consecration;" to this it is replied, "there is no offering of the elements in the prayer of consecration in the sense of a sacrifice to God the Father;" as if an oblation did not carry with it, necessarily, the "sense of sacrifice." This blundering over plain English, this violence done to language whose meaning is fixed, consecrated by immemorial usage, ought certainly to have suggested to him some "doubts" rather of his own "discernment and candor" than mine. But no—he goes on to venture his rash criticisms upon the prayer of consecration. That prayer begins with a recital of the facts, of the "One Oblation once offered on the Cross," and of "the institution of the perpetual memory of that sacrifice until His coming again." Then follows the consecration of the elements, and then the oblation, named as such in the margin, as follows:

"*The Oblation.* Wherefore O Lord and Heavenly *Father*, according to the institutions of Thy dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ, we, Thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before Thy Divine Majesty, *with these thy holy gifts*, which we now OFFER unto Thee, the memorial Thy Son hath commanded us to make."

In copying a portion of this passage, Dr. Durbin inserted in

brackets after the word "memorial," the words, "not the sacrifice"—as if the oblation unto God the Father, of His *holy* gifts were not the sacrifice commemorative and representative *to Him* of the One Oblation on the Cross; as if this were not the Eucharistic Sacrifice. No, no, Dr. Durbin, with the Liturgy before him, has no eyes to see that our Church makes oblation (*and she would not be a Church if she did not*); his acquaintance with the English language and the English Bible is not such as to teach him that "oblation" has the "sense of sacrifice;" and with a recklessness which amazes one, he says I have totally mistaken the doctrine of my Church on the Eucharist when I affirm that it is an oblation to God the Father! But something more startling remains to be told. Because I said—"This oblation, which gives the Eucharist its sacrificial character, is a universal rite in the Catholic Church,"—he tells me: "Here you *expressly declare*" (mark the words) "that you hold the *same view* of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist that the Roman Catholic Church holds." Admirable theologian! Will not the Protestant Association immediately retain him as their prosecuting attorney, after this manifestation of his skill in fixing the "mark of the beast" in my forehead? Because I say the oblation is a universal rite in the Catholic Church, therefore I hold the *same view* of that rite that the Roman Catholic holds! And so, I suppose, because I say that Baptism is a universal rite among all professing Christians except the Quakers, therefore I hold the same view of that rite with Methodists and Mormons too! Dr. Durbin's logic is quite as peculiar as his estimation of facts. What he means by the Roman Catholic view, he has elsewhere told us; it is, that "each good [R.] Catholic understands the sacrifice of the Mass to be a real *repetition* of the sacrifice of Christ for men.*" That I have said one word any where or at any time, to countenance such a doctrine, is utterly untrue; and just as untrue is his other and kindred assertion (p. 28), that I "defended an oblation of the elements as a propitiatory sacrifice *as the Romish Church teaches.*" Dr. Durbin seems to have been hurt that any one should have thought him capable of making "scandalous misrepresentations" of the Oxford divines; but I do not know what more

* Durbin's "Observations in Europe," Vol. i. p. 72.

safety they or any one might hope for in his hands than I have found. He has here done worse by me than make a "scandalous misrepresentation." I earnestly hope it may be true that he knows nothing of the subject he has ventured to write about; that he is ignorant of the meaning of the words he has used; for his charge against me is nothing less than what I would not dare to say except in defence of myself, or rather, of interests dearer to me than myself; but I do repeat, it is a palpable untruth.

It is a sad thing that I should be obliged to proceed to the doctrine of the Real Presence, and to speak of it in such a connection as this. It is almost too awful a subject to discuss here; and therefore to spare myself the pain, I shall endeavour, as far as I can, to confine myself to the words of the Church, in teaching her own doctrine.

But some attention must first be given to two or three of Dr. Durbin's characteristic assertions. He tells me that, being unable to deny that our communion service is *identical* with his own, I "endeavour to make out a difference by noting a change in the Methodist forms, of two words, and the omission of some prayers after the sacrament is concluded," which his ministers may say or not as they choose. A formal denial of this 'identity' I never indeed made, because there was no occasion for me to deny what I thought every body knew was not so. But let it be observed that he thus implies the identity of the two services, knowing too at the same time, that his service is without the distinguishing features of the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel, for the day; the creed, the offertory, the prayer for the Church, containing the oblation of alms and bread and wine, and the commemoration of the faithful departed, the absolution, the *Sursum corda*, ("Lift up your hearts,") the proper prefaces, the oblation of the *consecrated* elements and the invocation of the Holy Ghost upon them—besides other parts of less importance. Identity of the services indeed! Did any body but he ever imagine such a thing, much less assert it? Neither did I say one word about the omission of any prayers, and of course I drew no conclusion from such omission. He seems to have had in his mind what I said about the alterations and omissions in their baptismal service, viz. that they left out the addresses and prayers which asserted

that the person baptized "is regenerated,"—"regenerated by the Holy Spirit." This was part of my evidence that the Methodists had rejected our doctrine of baptism and of regeneration; and this evidence he was pleased so far to overlook as to assert (p. 21) that my argument in proof of the departure of Methodists from this fundamental article of the faith was not predicated of their baptismal service. Thus he denies that I noticed this flagrant fault when I did notice it; and he asserts that I noted the omission of prayers in his communion service, when I did no such thing. I was concerned with the *doctrine* of his communion service, and not with its difference from ours in other respects; and I pointed out a change in one word of prime importance, which showed the fundamental difference between us in respect of doctrine; and that was the change of the word "body" to "death" in the prayer "Grant us therefore gracious Lord so to eat the flesh of Thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood;" in which words both the benefits of the atonement and the life-giving grace of our Lord's Body are each asserted. On this Dr. Durbin remarks—

"The difference is in the use of the word *body* by *you* and *death* by *us*: [to be sure it is]. Now I appeal to the reader if he can detect any difference in these words as used in the service, unless he first assume the real presence of the body of Christ in the Sacrament?"

And so might a Socinian appeal from the formula of Baptism into the Name of the Holy Three, to his reader, and ask, if the passage taught the Triune Essence of the Godhead, unless the Trinity was first assumed? There is no assumption whatever. The words of the prayer are plain. It is not the way of the Church to address Almighty God in the language of the rhetorician; and her words in that prayer make nonsense, if they do not teach the doctrine of the Real Presence. They do assert it, and the Methodists knew it, and *therefore* they altered the prayer as is thus hesitatingly confessed.

"We with the genuine Protestant party in the Church disbelieve the *real presence of His Body* in the Sacrament and refer the *whole* to his death, and *therefore* we changed the word to cut off all *occasion* to claim the authority of the Church (i. e. of the 'Discipline') in favour of the real presence."

Exactly so; and now I shall show that the Church does make

a difference between the words *body* and *death;* and does not like the Methodists refer the "*whole*" to his death. In the exhortation giving notice of the Holy Communion there may be read as follows:

"Almighty God our Heavenly Father hath given His Son our Saviour Jesus Christ *not only* to *die* for us, but *also* to be our spiritual *food* and sustenance *in* that Holy Sacrament."

The testimony of the Homilies to this doctrine is as explicit as that of the Liturgy. In the advertisement at the close of the first book, we read of the "due receiving of His blessed Body and Blood *under the form* of Bread and Wine." In the Homily of the Resurrection it is said:—

"Thou hast received Him if in true faith and repentance of heart thou has received Him, if in purpose of amendment thou hast received Him for an everlasting pledge and gage of salvation. Thou hast received His Body which was once broken and His Blood which was once shed for the remission of sins. Thou hast received His Body to have within thee the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, for to dwell with thee, to *endow thee with grace*, to strengthen thee against thine enimies, and to comfort thee with their presence. Thou hast received His Body to *endow* thee *with everlasting righteousness*,* to assure thee of everlasting bliss, and life of thy soul."

In the Homily "of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament" we are told,

"Thus much we *must be sure* to hold, that in the supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no *bare* sign, no untrue figure of a thing *absent: But*, as the Scripture saith, the table of the Lord, the bread and cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, the annunciation of His death, yea, the communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord in a marvellous *incorporation* which, by the co-operation of the Holy Ghost, (the very bond of our conjunction with Christ) is through faith *wrought in* the souls of the faithful whereby not only their souls live to eternal life,* but they surely trust to win their bodies a resurrection to immortality. The true understanding of this fruition and union which is betwixt the Body and the Head, the true believers and Christ, the ancient Catholic Fathers,† both perceiving themselves, and commending to their people, were not afraid to call *this supper*, some of them, the *salve* of immortality and sovereign preservative against death; other, a deifical communion; other, the sweet dainties of our Saviour, the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope *of the resurrection*."

And again: It is well known that the meat we seek for *in this supper* is spiritual

* The intelligent reader will here perceive the gift of justification through the Sacrament faithfully received.

† Irenæus, Ignatius, Dionysius, Origen, Optatus and Cyprian are referred to by name.

food, the nourishment of our soul, a heavenly reflection and not earthly; an *invisible meat*, and not bodily; a ghostly *substance*, and not carnal, so that to think that without faith we may enjoy the eating and drinking thereof or that that is the fruition of it, is but to dream a gross and carnal feeding, basely objecting and binding ourselves to the elements and creatures. Whereas by the advice of the Council of Nicene, we ought to lift up our minds by faith, and, leaving these inferior and earthly things, there seek it where the sun of righteousness ever shineth. Take then this lesson, O thou that are desirous of this table, of Emissenus, a godly father, that when thou goest up to the reverend communion, to be satisfied with spiritual meats, thou look up *with faith* upon the holy Body and Blood of thy God, thou marvel with reverence, thou touch it with the mind, thou receive it with the hand of thy heart, and then take it fully with thy inward man."

An argument has been drawn sometimes, and lastly by the Bishop of Vermont,* from a rubric in the office for "the communion of the sick," in order to show that the Real Presence or "inward grace" is not, acording to the judgment of our Church, in unity with the consecrated offering; and that in *that rubric* may be seen the wide difference between us and the Church of Rome. I cannot but express my astonishment, at such a conclusion, in spite of my unfeigned respect for the abilities, learning and character, of those who maintain it. It is well known that the Church of Rome teaches *the very doctrine* of that Rubric, and acts upon it much more than we do ourselves. The decree of the Council of Trent is this:—

"But as to the use, our fathers have rightly and wisely pointed out three modes of receiving *this Holy Sacrament*. For they have taught that some partake of it only sacramentally, viz. sinners; but others spiritually, those to wit, who with hearty desire, eating that consecrated heavenly bread by a living faith which worketh by love, discern its fruit and benefit; lastly, the third partake at once sacramentally *and spiritually*: but these are they who examine and prepare themselves beforehand, that, clad in the wedding garment, they may,"† &c.

It is on the ground of this spiritual communion without par-

* "Novelties which disturb our peace," No. 3, pp. 34, 35.

† Sess. xiii. c. 8. Quoad usum autem, recte et sapienter patres nostri tres rationes hoc sanctum sacramentum accipiendi distinxerunt. Quosdam enim docuerunt sacramentaliter duntaxat id sumere ut peccatores, alios autem spiritualiter, illos nimirum, qui, voto propositum illum cœlestem panem edentes, fide vivâ, quæ per dilectionem operatur, fructum ejus et utilitatem sentiunt; tertios porro sacramentaliter simul et spiritualiter: hi autem sunt, qui se prius probant et instruunt, ut vestem nuptialem induti, &c.

taking of the consecrated species, that Roman Catholics practise what our writers are wont to consider a great abuse, viz. that of leaving communion very much to the Priest, they joining with him, mentally and spiritually. This spiritual communion, therefore, surely ought to be the very last thing referred to, whereby to point out the difference in Doctrine between the two churches; for in this they *are agreed*, whatever else may be said in other respects.

But to return to the Homilies: I suppose it is quite superfluous to ask if any such doctrine as that which they deliver, (which was the doctrine of our Reformers) is ever taught by Methodists? Different as it is undoubtedly from those gross conceptions of that Holy Mystery which we commonly ascribe to Roman Catholics,* and which transubstantiation, and the view of the Eucharistic Oblation consequent thereupon, seem to make necessary; it is yet more different from the low and freezing view which Zwingle invented, which the Methodists have inherited from him, and which, though widely differing from that of Luther, is still the only one which is consistent with the latter's famous doctrine of justification. Nevertheless Dr. Durbin, who in his own way, has a wonderful facility in getting rid of difficulties which would baffle and appal any one else, asserts of his own great efforts at theological discussion:

"What I have said will convince you that the doctrine of the two Churches [i. e. of the Methodists and the Church] is identical. It now remains for me to show what this doctrine is, and that you do not hold it; but that you hold substantially the Roman Catholic doctrine of the Sacrament."

Here are great promises and grevious accusations. Let us now examine the means adopted to fulfil the one and to substantiate the other. He goes on:

"The true Protestant doctrine of the Sacrament is 'an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace.'—*Catechism.* A Sacrament then consisteth in the 'outward sign' and the thing signified which is 'the inward and spiritual grace.' These are two, and a child for whom the Catechism was designed can easily distinguish them."

The two last sentences of this passage are very good and very true; but let the reader mark the first, which contains what pur-

* It is a palpable misrepresentation of the Homilies, when persons of Zwinglian views quote passages, directed specially against the current errors of their time, as if they were written against the doctrine taught in the Liturgy and Catechism.

ports to be our Church's definition of a Sacrament, the definition of our Catechism; what he calls the "true Protestant doctrine." Will it be believed by those persons who have placed confidence in Dr. Durbin's statements, "the leaders' meeting" to wit, and his other unenviable abettors and "flatterers," in the miserable work to which he has lent himself, that their redoubteble champion, has, in his quotation from our Catechism, suppressed two-thirds of the passage he pretends to cite, and that passage A DEFINITION! Yes, a definition, every line and letter of which is sacred, *sacred* from its nature as a *definition*. He has suppressed the body of a brief doctrinal definition, in order that, in his hands, our teaching may appear as "true Protestant doctrine," and so square with Methodism. He has suppressed the doctrine of our Church in order to make it out to his ill-informed reader, that I depart from her teaching and hold substantially to that of Rome. Among all the "tricks of modern controversy" can a procedure like this be found? Let the lover of justice and truth, he only whose opinion I care to ask, let him compare the above quotation with what the Catechism does say:

Q. "What meanest thou by this word Sacrament?"

A. "I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ Himself, as a *means whereby we receive the same*, and a pledge to assure us thereof."*

Here it will be perceived that the suppressed portion of the definition contains the *gist* of the whole controversy, which is, not as to what either Sacrament may signify, but what they are the means of conveying. The definition shows that the outward sign is ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the inward grace it signifies; to wit, that water in the Sacrament of Baptism is the means whereby, under the ministration of the Holy Ghost, we spiritually receive the grace of regeneration, or, "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness;" and that Bread and Wine in the Eucharist are the means whereby, under the like ministration of the Holy Ghost, we spiritually receive the thing signified, viz. the Body and Blood of Christ.

* An erroneous punctuation has crept into some editions of the American Prayer Book, viz. the insertion of a comma between the words 'grace' and 'given.' The punctuation I have followed is the standard one, as may be seen in the editions of the Oxford University Press.

Does this act of suppressing the *gist* of a doctrinal definition in order to subserve the ends Dr. Durbin proposed to himself in his discourses and in his Letter, amount to a "scandalous misrepresentation?" If not, I know not what does, or what can. And this very thing did he do in his first discourse; he then, in like manner, withheld that part of the definition which gives the *differentia*, the essential characteristic of the thing defined; and that too, in order to exhibit "the true Protestant doctrine," as being that of our Church; and by contrast to show, that there was a large body of our divines who were putting forth views of the Sacraments not warranted by the Church, but directly opposed to her authoritative teaching. And though I was aware of this fact, though I knew that some had thus been shamefully led astray, yet could I not bring myself to notice in my letter to him, so flagrant an outrage. It seemed to me to be altogether too serious a matter, involving consequences too momentous to his reputation, for me even to allude to it in print, without the evidence of it in the author's own hand. I should have shrunk from speaking of it, even if I had heard it myself. But he has now published it to the world, and its fearful consequences he must bear, without reproaching any one but himself.

And now with these facts before him let the reader contemplate the innocent simplicity, the guilelessness of the following paragraph:

"Had you not been of the 'straitest sect of the Pharisees,' which made you say in your Letter, 'I OF COURSE was not present when you delivered the aforesaid discourse,' I am sure you would have testified also to the delicacy and candor (!) with which I treated all persons and parties, your 'ignorant' informant notwithstanding—ignorant she* must be or she could not have been 'scandalized' by my manifest 'misrepresentations.'"

Having already far exceeded the limits that I proposed to myself, I am forced to bring my remarks to an abrupt conclusion. The importance of the subjects discussed, has tempted me to a greater length than I should otherwise have gone. I wished this review also to possess an interest beyond that which local circumstances

* I know not what to make of this indelicate, unmanly allusion. Dr. Durbin is informed that no such person as he imagines, gave me any accounts of his sayings and doings. I have the testimony of his own friends to the truth of what I have asserted.

may give it. I had other aims, than the exposure of Dr. Durbin. I have endeavoured so to exhibit the doctrine to which I have vowed submission, as to remove misapprehensions, to assist persons in difficulty, and to relieve those minds from doubt and alarm, who are anxious to abide by the teaching of "the Church of the Living God, which is the pillar and stay of the truth." That teaching is embodied in our Book of Common Prayer; it is Catholic, it is Apostolic, coëval with the Church of Christ. We received it not from the private judgment of any man, for we are not followers of men. It came to us by inspiration of the Holy Ghost. The things which the Apostles committed to their successors, to be handed over to other faithful men, who might be able to teach others also (2 Tim. ii. 2), have come down to us; they are guaranteed to us by the unfailing word of Him who promised to be with His Apostles every day until the consummation of the world. Even "if we believe not, yet He abideth faithful; He cannot deny himself." "The gates of Hell never can *prevail* against His Church." They may attack her, they may for a time be reared in her midst; and so may painfully engross the vision of many that are endeavouring to set their eyes towards Heaven. But these evils will have an end; they are fast coming to an end. The bow of hope is already cast upon the clouds that have been afflicting us with storms. *Sursum Corda!* "The Lord is not slack concerning his promise as some men count slackness," and we may therefore wait with patience and with confidence, the fulfilment of His word. On this rock we rest. We know that we are in His Church, and so partake of His Life and fulness, because she is His Body. We know that we are in His Church, enjoying unrestrained access to His Holy Word; and therefore will humble minds within her obtain a certain knowledge of His truth, because she is "the pillar and stay of the truth," the "temple of the Holy Ghost," who is the Guide to all truth. Within her pale the light of Heaven illumines the all-sufficient record of our Lord's life and labours, His Divine discourse, and the teaching of His Apostles; and there "sitting at His feet" we are "taught by Him," and learn from the LIVING LETTER of His Word, "the truth as it is in Jesus." "Heaven and Earth shall pass away, but MY WORDS SHALL NOT PASS AWAY."

APPENDIX.

A.

THE RIGHT OF PRIVATE JUDGMENT.

The following remarks on this much controverted topic could not be introduced into the foregoing Review without too great an interference with the main subject. They are, therefore, thrown together here, for the consideration of the thoughtful.*

In Morals, *right* is the correlative to *ought* and *duty*. We have a right to do what we ought to do; *a* right to do only what *is* right. We have no right to disobey God; but we have the liberty; and if we do so it is at our own peril. Consequently, as every man who can, ought to learn the Christian faith, so it is his right to do so. In this sense the right of individual judgment is not opposed to Church authority; for the Church guarantees the right, nor only so, but helps the individual to exercise it. Again, God has appointed certain means whereby we may learn His truth; and as every man ought to make use of all those means, so he has no right to neglect any one of them. Now, as we learn from St. Paul, God has set up an institution which is the "Pillar and Ground of the Truth," "the Church of the living God," and man has, can have, no right to turn away his eyes from the established stay of the truth. But he has the liberty to do so, and if he choose to act thus, heresy is the inevitable consequence, sooner or later.

The constant profession of any doctrine by the whole Church from the beginning, thus becomes an infallible proof of the truth of that doctrine. It is a proof that we are bound to seek after, and which we have no right to forego. The belief of truth susceptible of such proof, is a condition of remaining in the favour of God. "Let that therefore abide in you which ye have heard *from the beginning;* if that which ye have heard from the beginning abide in you, ye also shall continue in the Father and the Son." (1 John ii. 24.)

The present teaching of any sect, or any portion of the Church is, to persons under that teaching, *prima facie* evidence, that it has been heard from the beginning. But if, after acting upon it with a good conscience, one find that without any fault on his part, it fails in carrying him on to fulfil the law of Christ; he may be assured that there is something wrong in his creed.

* The July No. of the True Catholic has an article on Private Judgment, containing thoughts similar to some here expressed. I feel it due to myself to say, that what is here offered, was written before I saw the last number of that admirable publication.

Here then there is good reason for "examining himself," to see "whether he be in the faith," whether he believes anything which has not, or believes not anything which has, been heard from the beginning. And so far as he may thus correct his individual faith, he will do so by exercising his private judgment, that is, by deferring to evidence, by appealing from the local teaching which he has hitherto followed, to Catholicity. Of course he will be bound to make a diligent use of the New Testament, in prosecuting so momentous an inquiry, in order that he may see wherein the said teaching contradicts that holy volume. But here he is met by the difficulty, that all heresies have their proof texts, all systems profess to be derived from the Bible. Let him then carefully inquire whether the system in which he has been trained adopts, or is able to adopt, all the doctrinal statements of the New Testament; for they are all constituent portions of one integral body of divine truth. If it do not, it is fundamentally wrong; it rejects those portions which it does not use; *it would not reject them if it could use them.* To take an example already used (p. 34), if that system does not announce in its regular ordinary teaching, that Baptism is "for the remission of sins," (Acts ii. 38); that by Baptism we are "baptized into Christ's death," (Rom. vi. 2,) and "put on Christ," (Gal. iii. 27,) and that in Baptism "we are risen with Him," (Col. ii. 12)—it is not simply erroneous or defective; it is *heterogeneous* to the New Testament; it is rotten at the core, and cannot be reformed.

This is, or should be, the first step in bringing any teaching to the infallible test of Catholicity; and in most instances this one will be found sufficient to detect error. The inspired writings show what was the Church's teaching at the beginning, and of course they must be used to know what has been taught *always*. The authentic records of the Church from that time forwards, her liturgies and canons, the writings of her doctors and apologists, and the lives of the saints, which are the distinctive fruits of her faith—form all together an overwhelming testimony to the exactness and integrity of her Creed; an unimpeachable witness to one harmonious body of truth, and one way of salvation, as having been authoritatively taught by the Church "always and everywhere." The faith of the Church is a fact in history, as easily identified at any given time, as her own existence, and much more easily than many facts which it would be thought the extremest folly to disbelieve. Here then is the second test which is to be applied to any teaching that challenges our acceptance, a test to which scripture points us, as has been shown; and one by which the Apostles themselves would have their own later teaching tried, by those who heard them. "If *we*, or an angel from Heaven," says St. Paul, "preach unto you any other Gospel than that we *have preached* unto you, let him be accursed." To try any doctrines by these tests is surely to exercise the private judgment, to act upon the most fearful individual responsibility; and yet in doing so one would not sit in judgment upon the Catholic Church, for all this is but a preliminary step to dutiful submission to the faith. Such an inquiry would proceed upon the assumption, that there is such a body of truth as the Catholic faith, and every step in it is an act of obedience. There would be no aim at making private

interpretations of scripture, but on the contrary a search after that which from the beginning has been common to the whole Church.

There is "one Body" and of course but "one Faith" (Eph. iv. 5); but if each individual may have a creed of his own, then it as necessarily follows that each individual may be a Church to himself, which is the highest absurdity. And the mere circumstance that any number of individuals associate together because their private opinions agree, does not remove this absurdity; they are not a church, as they would themselves unconsciously confess by not thinking guilty of the sin of schism, any who should see fit, for their own good reasons, to leave their associates. There must be a church before schism can be possible; and conversely, where that sin is impossible there is no church. Now is it not a fact that the members of the different protestant sects are freely dismissed from one to another as being in "good standing?" which would be absurd if their pastors believed there was a grievous sin upon the heads of those thus dismissed. May not a Methodist become a Presbyterian if he think fit, or a Presbyterian a Baptist or Lutheran, and so on, without being thought by others to imperil his salvation, or even thinking so himself? How often do such transmigrations occur without the charge or the consciousness of guilt? How often for mere convenience sake? Is not this abundant proof that the possibility of committing schism never occurs to the thoughts of such persons? Is it not proof that that sin is impossible on their principles, and consequently, that they confess, unconsciously, that they are not in the Church of Christ, and care not whether they are or no? A remarkable illustration of the argument I am here urging is furnished by the Rev. Albert Barnes, who, in his truthful* and effective publications on our Church, so speaks of the "inborn horror" with which every genuine member of the Church regards the sin of schism, as to show that he is himself unable to appreciate such a sentiment. It is one which he

* I use the word "truthful" deliberately, and with more pleasure because Mr. Barnes has been assailed as having stated in his first pamphlet "what he knew at the time to be untrue." Of course I do not agree with him in all he says. He makes some mistakes, and labours under grievous misapprehensions in respect of some of our doctrines; but this he cannot help, because he views our church from without, and through the medium of his own system. There is, however throughout his essay, proof of his single aim to see what the truth is, and to state it with plainness. His main position, and his arguments to sustain it, are alike impregnable. In reading his words one should take them in his own obvious meaning; and so understanding him, when he says, "*it has never been possible permanently to connect Evangelical religion with a religion of forms,*" I agree with him; and add, moreover, that a truer word never was spoken. What Mr. Barnes means by 'Evangelical religion,' never was thought of by the Catholic Church. Neither was any such 'connexion' attempted at the Reformation as Mr. Barnes thinks. Surely the Baptismal office of the Reformed Church of England might have convinced him of that; so also would the Articles, if he did

never feels; it is what he, as a Presbyterian, cannot feel. It appears to him to be a superstition, or an inexplicable weakness. And yet the schismatical temper which individual preferences created in the Church of Corinth, was rebuked by St. Paul in such terms as these: "While one saith I am of Paul, and another, I of Apollos, are ye not carnal? . . . . . Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you? If any man destroy (marg. transl.) the temple of God, him shall God destroy; for the temple of God is holy, which temple ye are." And he who commits schism, or cherishes the temper, does all he can to destroy or at least to injure "the temple of God." One would then be glad to learn from Mr. Barnes and those who think with him, what are the principles or antecedent conditions on which the sin thus denounced by St. Paul is possible? The modern figment of an invisible Church on earth, supposing its reality, cannot possibly be afflicted with any such evil. On the Calvinistic hypothesis "neither death nor life, angels, principalities nor powers, can separate" a member from such a body. Not schism only, but no sin at all could thus avail. It surely then would become considerate persons, to give a little more heed to this matter than it usually meets with. There is such a sin as schism; it is denounced in the New Testament; it is one that the members of the Church of Christ are liable to. Does it not therefore behoove every man who calls himself a Christian, to know what that sin is, and how it may be committed, in order that he may shun it, and all temptations to it? How else is one to know that he is not guilty of this sin, or at the least is not a partaker of other men's sins, saying "I am of Paul or Apollos?" Will not some persons exercise their private judgment, and act upon their individual responsibility, in investigating this all important matter?

not make the 17th, interpreted by the Westminster Confession, the exponent of the whole thirty-nine. What is known as the "Evangelical party" in the Church, is little more than fifty years old; it is the school of Romaine, Newton, Cecil, and Scott. They have nothing to do even with the low church or latitudinarian party, which arose after the Restoration, and came into full power under Tillotson and Burnet, with the state to support them, after the Revolution of 1688. The "Evangelical" movement was a reaction upon the stupefaction which the low church teaching had brought upon the Church. Its mission under God was to undo the mischief wrought by the state-school of Tillotson and Burnet; it has succeeded to a great extent and is now expiring. It was able to break down, but is wholly impotent at reconstruction upon the original basis of the Church. The latitudinarians reaped what they sowed; they supplied the "Evangelicals" with the means to overthrow themselves. They began by trampling on the sacred principles of the Church, and at last were put down by those who did their own work at a more thoroughgoing rate. Coleridge somewhere says that 'no principle was ever sacrificed which did not in the end, fully revenge itself by making reprisals;' the history of the Church constantly bears witness to the truth of this remark.

There is a further thought suggested by the loud boasts which one hears so often of the "right of private judgment," as these words are commonly taken. If a man has the right to interpret the doctrinal parts of the New Testament, so as to construct for himself a creed, distinct from that which has always been professed by the Church Catholic; has he not also the same right to put a new interpretation upon the moral precepts, and so make for himself a new ethical code? Where is the difference so far as the "right" is concerned? The right claimed is, to interpret *the Bible* each one for himself, and as each one chooses; and ethics are as much a part of the Bible as its doctrines. Christian morals, both in their science and practice, are as peculiar to the New Law as Christian doctrines. The former are the distinctive fruit of the latter, and the two are therefore inseparable; precept often teaching doctrine, and doctrine precept. Why then do not people as boldly avow their right to put new meanings into the passages condemning vices, and enjoining good works, as they do in respect of those which speak of the doctrine of good works, justification, regeneration, the virtue of the Sacraments, the nature of the Church, and ministry? Sad as it is to know that the "right" so to call it, has been freely exercised, though a distinct avowal of it is seldom heard. Symptoms, however, of private interference with the established ethical code of the Church, began to appear soon after the discovery of what is called the "right of private judgment"; that is, soon after any individual's interpretation of the Bible was assumed to be the same with the Bible itself. Luther in his celebrated commentary on the Galatians remarks:—"Although this is as clear as noonday, yet the Papists are so senseless and blind, that out of the Gospel they have fashioned a law of love, and out of Christ a law giver, who hath imposed far more burdensome laws than Moses himself. But the Gospel (?) teacheth, Christ hath come, not to give a new law, but to offer himself up as a victim for the sins of the whole world." Singular indeed, but quite Luther-like is the contrast in which this passage stands to our Lord's Sermon on the mount, and to His other words: "He that hath my commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; and he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father." And again, "when Thomas of Aquin and other schoolmen assert that the law hath been abolished, they pretend that the Mosaic ordinances respecting judicial affairs, and in like manner the laws respecting ceremonies and the services of the temple were after the death of Christ pernicious, and on that account were set aside and abolished. But, when they say the Ten Commandments are not to be abrogated they themselves understand not what they assert or lay down.

"But thou when thou speakest of the abolition of the law be mindful that thou speakest of the law as it really is, and is rightly called, to wit, the *spiritual law*, and understand thereby the whole law making no distinction between civil laws, ceremonies, and ten commandments."

The doctrinal bearing of these passages is easily seen. They illustrate Luther's great dogma. It does not seem to have entered his mind that Christians are under higher obligations to observe the moral law than the

Jews were, because our gifts will enable us to fulfil it. St. Paul says, "Sin" (mark the word; it is not law but *sin*) "shall not *have dominion* over you, *for* ye are not under the law but under *grace*;" as much as to say, that under the old law sin had dominion; but under the dispensation of grace it need not have, and shall not if we be faithful; for "*the righteousness of the law* may be *fulfilled in us* who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit."

M hler, to whom I am indebted for these quotations from Luther, cites (§18) also the following passage from his "Table Talk:"—"And it would not be good for us to do all that God commands, for He would thereby be deprived of His Divinity and would become *a liar*, and could not remain true!" Corresponding with all this is the concession of Luther, Bucer, Melancthon, and others of their party, to the Landgrave of Hesse, to take to himself *two wives.*

To conclude: it may be observed that as the moral code which the Church has ever maintained does not interfere with any individual's rights, but by grace rather helps one to lead a life of purity and holiness; so the Creed of the Church is not opposed to any *real* private rights, but on the contrary secures to one freedom from heresy and schism.

B.

Dr. Durbin on p. 7 of his letter says that the Methodists derived their ordination from the same source whence we obtained ours. I do not think a statement like this at all worthy of any reply. It however furnishes a happy introduction to the following extracts from a startling tract lately published in Baltimore, entitled "A Letter to a Methodist by a Presbyter of the Diocese of Maryland." They will doubtless put intelligent Methodists in the possession of certain facts of which they must be ignorant. Methodists ought to recollect that they are *Wesleyans*—the disciples of *one man.* They ought to remember that by him they were first formed into a party in the Church, whence the passage to open schism was easy. This man too, whatever may have been his merits, was not inspired. He had no credentials to show that he was called of God to consummate such a work as the founding of a new church. And then they should bear in mind that God once reproved man for making even an attachment to inspired Apostles, the excuse for schism. Let them calmly reflect upon what follows, and ask themselves what sort of a Commentary their history furnishes upon this text, "Now this I say that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ. Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you, or were you baptized in the name of Paul. For while one saith I am of Paul; and another I of Apollos; are ye not carnal?" 1 Cor. i. 12, 13; iii. 4.

Wesley's Ordinations.

"On this point rests the validity of the Methodist ministry. If Wesley had authority to ordain Dr. Coke *a Bishop*, then it is conceded that the Methodists have a lawful ministry and lawful sacraments; but, if Wesley had no such

authority to ordain him, then his ordination of Dr. Coke was a nullity, and the Methodists have neither a *lawful* ministry, nor *lawful* sacraments; and as there cannot be a Christian Church without a *lawful* ministry and *lawful* sacraments, it will, in that case, necessarily follow, that what is called the "Methodist Church," is not, as such, a part of the Church of Christ.

Now, lest you might suppose that some wrong is done to the Methodists in the *issue* here made, I shall quote the *first section* of their "Book of Discipline," to prove that the entire validity of the Methodist ministry is made by *themselves* to rest upon Wesley's ordination of Dr. Coke. It is as follows:

"*On the* ORIGIN *of the Methodist Episcopal Church.*"

"The preachers* and members of our Society in general, being convinced that there was a great deficiency of vital religion in the Church of England in America, and being in many places destitute of the Christian Sacraments, as several of the clergy had forsaken their churches, requested the late Rev. *John Wesley* to take such measures, in his wisdom and prudence, as would afford them suitable relief in their distress.

"In consequence of this, our venerable friend, who, under God, has been the father of the great revival of religion now extending over the earth by means of the Methodists, determined to *ordain* ministers for America; and, for this purpose, in the year 1784, sent over three *regularly*† ordained clergy: but preferring Episcopal mode of Church government to any other, he solemnly set apart, by the imposition of *his* hands and prayer, *one* of them, viz. *Thomas Coke*, Doctor of Civil Law, late of Jesus College, in the University of Oxford, and *a Presbyter* of the Church of England, for the Episcopal office; and having delivered to him letters of Episcopal orders, commissioned‡ and directed him to set apart *Francis Asbury*, then general assistant of the Methodist Society in America, for the same Episcopal office; he, the said *Francis Asbury*, being first ordained deacon and elder.§ In consequence of which, the said *Francis Asbury* was solemnly set apart for the said Episcopal office by prayer, and the imposition of the hands of the said *Thomas Coke*, other regularly ordained‖ ministers assisting in the sacred ceremony. At which time¶ the General Conference held at Baltimore, did

* At this time, the preachers were considered only *lay-preachers*, and according to the uniform advice of Mr. Wesley, had declined administering the sacraments. In 1778, a few of these *lay-preachers*, in Virginia, undertook to ordain each other, thinking *thereby* to get the power of administering the sacraments! but, by a vote of one of the Conferences, this ordination was declared INVALID! (Life of Wesley by Coke and Moore, chap. 3, sec. 2.)

† These "*regularly*" ordained clergy, were clergy of the Church of England. They were not ordained by Wesley. The Methodists here *themselves* draw the distinction between "*regularly* ordained clergy" and Wesley's ordinations.

‡ Lest it might be supposed, that Wesley had "commissioned" Dr. Coke, in these (so-called) "*letters of Episcopal orders*," to "set *apart*" Mr. Asbury for the "same Episcopal office," it is proper to state that no such "commission" is given to Dr. Coke in said "letters." Where is this "commission" *to be found?*

§ As some might think from this language, that *Wesley* had "first ordained [Mr. Asbury] deacon and elder," it should be known, that Asbury received *no* ordination from *Wesley*. He was only a *layman*, when Dr. Coke came to America; and Dr. Coke ordained him a *deacon*, *elder*, and *superintendent*, or, (as he afterwards called himself,) a *Bishop*, in the course of a few days! (See Lee's "Short History of the Methodists," p. 94.)

‖ One of *these* "regularly ordained" ministers was a *German* minister named *Otterbine!* (Lee's History, p. 94.)

¶ This is not *true*. The General Conference did *not* at that "time" receive Coke and Asbury as *Bishops*, as will be shown hereafter.

unanimously receive the said *Thomas Coke* and *Francis Asbury* as their Bishops, being fully satisfied of the validity of their Episcopal ordination."

Thus you will perceive that the validity of the Methodist ministry is made, by the Methodists *themselves*, to depend on the validity of Dr. Coke's ordination by Wesley.

Let us then seriously inquire, where did Wesley obtain the *Authority* to ordain Dr. Coke?

It certainly was not *born* with him; for authority to ordain a minister of Christ is born with no man.

He could not have obtained it from any *temporal* power; for all the kings and governors of the earth combined cannot ordain a minister of Christ, nor confer the authority to ordain one.

Was this authority conferred on Wesley at his *ordination?*—Plainly not: because the authority for ordaining in the Church of England, (of which Wesley was a member,) is confined *exclusively* to the order of *Bishops*, and Wesley was not consecrated a Bishop, but only ordained a *Presbyter*. As no such authority was then conferred on Wesley; he did not obtain it when he was ordained.

That you may perceive at a glance, what authority was conferred on Wesley when he was ordained, I shall transcribe the very *words* used by the Bishop who ordained him. You may find them in the Office for "The ordering of Priests," in the Book of Common Prayer; they are as follows:

"Receive the Holy Ghost for the office and work of a *Priest* in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands: whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain they are retained: And *be thou a faithful Dispenser of the Word of God, and of His holy Sacraments:* In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."

By this *form*, every Presbyter of the Church of England is ordained; of course, Wesley was thus ordained; and you may thus perceive, at once, that *no authority to ordain* was then committed unto him.

But here your preachers meet us with the argument, that Bishops and Presbyters are one and the *same order* of ministers; and, therefore, Wesley being a *Presbyter*, was also a *Bishop*, and therefore had authority to ordain—and this, too, in the teeth of the fact, as I have just proved, that no such authority was given to him at his ordination! Whether Bishop and Presbyter be the *same order*, is a point I shall consider hereafter; at present I shall content myself with showing, that this argument will not avail the Methodists in the least, because:

If Wesley were a *Bishop*, because he was a *Presbyter*, then Dr. Coke must also have been a *Bishop*, since *he* was a *Presbyter* when Wesley "laid his hands on him." And if Dr. Coke was already a Bishop, what did Wesley make him by ordaining him? Not a Bishop, surely; for he was one already, if Presbyters and Bishops be the *same order!* What then? He must have made him an officer higher than a Bishop—an officer unknown to the Church of God! Besides, if Dr. Coke, being a Presbyter, was, *therefore*, a Bishop, he had the same right to ordain Wesley, as Wesley had to ordain him!

This argument, I consider so unanswerable and conclusive, to prove the invalidity of Coke's ordination, that I might here let the subject rest; but, before I close shall again advert to it, for reasons which will then appear.

Having thus disposed of one of the chief arguments by which the Methodists attempt to show that Wesley had authority to ordain, I shall now proceed to consider their other great argument, namely, that Wesley had a "Providential call" to ordain.

When Wesley sent out Dr. Coke, he gave him the following instrument of writing, which "The Book of Discipline," above quoted, calls his "*letters of Episcopal orders:*"

"To all to whom these presents shall come, John Wesley, late fellow of Lincoln College, in Oxford, *Presbyter* of the Church of England, sendeth greeting:

"Whereas, many of the people in the Southern Provinces of North America, who desire to continue under my care, *and still adhere to the doctrine and discipline*

of the Church of England, are greatly distressed for want of ministers to administer the sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, according to the usage of the same Church: and, whereas, *there does not appear to be any other way of supplying them with ministers*—

"Know all men, that I, John Wesley, think myself to be providentially called at this time to set apart some persons for the work of the ministry in America. And therefore, under the protection of Almighty God, and with a single eye to his glory, I have this day set apart as a *Superintendent*, by the imposition of my hands* and prayer, (being assisted by other ordained ministers,) Thomas Coke, Doctor of Civil Law, a *Presbyter* of the Church of England, and a man whom I judge to be well qualified for that great work. And I do hereby *recommend* him to all whom it may concern, as a fit person to preside over the flock of Christ. In testimony whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and seal, this second day of September, in the year of our Lord, one thousand seven hundred and eighty-four.† JOHN WESLEY."

Whatever may be meant by the phrase, "*providentially called*," in the above document, Wesley has saved us the trouble of finding it out, for he expressly tells us *why* he thought he had this "providential call," *namely, because, there does not appear to be any other way of supplying them with ministers.*

That this was Wesley's true reason for thinking *himself* "providentially called" to undertake this business, is made still plainer by his letter, dated "Bristol, 10th September, 1784," (only eight days after he "laid hands" on Dr. Coke,) addressed to "Dr. Coke, Mr. Asbury, and our brethren in North America,"‡ in which, on adverting to the above transaction, he says:

"If any one will point out a more rational and scriptural way of feeding and guiding these poor sheep in the wilderness, *I will gladly embrace it.* At present *I cannot see* any better method than I have taken."

Whether Wesley, then, had a "providential call" to ordain, depends upon the *fact*, whether there was "*any other way*" to obtain ministers for God's Church, (for the Methodists had not yet left the Church,) than his taking upon *himself* the authority to ordain Dr. Coke; because, if it can be plainly shown that there *was* an "other way," then it is evident, on Wesley's own ground, that he had no such "providential call."

Rightly to solve this question, it will be necessary to advert to the position of the American Church at that time. Before these "United States" were separated from Great Britain by the Revolution, the Church of England had been planted in several of them, and the jurisdiction over these Churches and their ministers was committed to the Bishop of London. After the Revolution, consequently, when this country was separated from Great Britain, the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London was, practically, at an end, and the American Church was thus left without an available ecclesiastical head. Some wise men of late, among the Methodists, have affected to think, that the Church in this country was *destroyed*, because it had lost its Bishop! It was no more destroyed, than the Church in New York, or Maryland, would be destroyed, should she lose her

* This "imposition of hands" was not done in a *Church*, openly before the people, but in Wesley's *bed-chamber* in Bristol! It soon, however, got noised about, that Wesley had made a *Bishop!* (though there is not a word of the kind in these "letters of *Episcopal* orders," as they are called.) The Rev. Charles Wesley, who was not in *the secret*, on hearing of it, wrote the following epigram:

"So easily are *Bishops* made,
By man's, or woman's whim;
Wesley his hands on Coke hath laid,—
But—who laid hands on him?"

† Reprinted from a tract written by Dr. George Peck, a Methodist preacher.

‡ Lee's Short History, page 91.

Bishop, by death, degradation, or resignation. The remedy was the same in both cases, *to elect another*, and have him *consecrated by lawful authority*. And this was done by the Presbyters of the American Church: they elected four of their number to the office of Bishop; and these four proceeded to England, where *three* of them were consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and *one* of them in Scotland by the Bishops of the Church in that country. The successors and spiritual descendants of these *four*, deriving their authority from the blessed Redeemer, through "the imposition of the hands" of His *lawful* Bishops, have multiplied to *twenty-two*, with a prospect of further increase; and their authority is acknowledged by more than *twelve hundred* clergy, who derive their ordination from them and their predecessors.—Here, then, *was* an "other way" of obtaining a supply of ministers, than by a *Presbyter* undertaking to ordain another Presbyter *a Bishop* in his chamber! And, as Wesley makes his "providential call" depend on the *fact* of there not being "any other way," and this proof that there was another way, makes it plain to a demonstration, that Wesley had no "providential call" to ordain whatever! It was just *seventy-three days* after this ordination of Dr. Coke, that Dr. Seabury was consecrated in Scotland, to be the Bishop of the Church in Connecticut. Had Wesley, therefore, waited but *seventy-three days*, he would have seen that God was providing a lawful ministry for His Church, and that he did not need the aid of the superintendent of a Methodist society to do the work for Him. Strange—passing strange—it is, it never should have crossed Wesley's mind, that God could provide ministers for his Church, without *his* instrumentality!* Strange, too, when there were, at least, one hundred "regularly ordained" Presbyters of the Church remaining here, (after she had been separated, by the Revolution, from the Mother Church of England,) that, if there were to be a "providential call" to ordain ministers, it did not occur to Wesley the "call" would have been given to one of *them* instead of *him*. Four of them were "called," as I have shown, by those possessing authority to call and ordain ministers for the Church of Christ, namely, by the lawful Bishops of the Churches of England and Scotland; thus showing, beyond the power of contradiction, that God had not forsaken His Church, and that Wesley's thinking (for he tells us he only *thought* so,) that *he* had a "providential call," was only the imagining of a fallible man, trusting too much to his own narrow view of the circumstances in which he was placed. And thus, sir, is scattered to the winds, the other grand argument for the validity of Wesley's ordinations.

Hitherto, you will have observed, I have argued this question on the ground taken by the Methodists, that Wesley *ordained* Dr. Coke, to be a *Bishop*—by a Bishop meaning the first and highest officer of the Church of God, and that Wesley himself was such a Bishop. But this we deny, because,

1. Wesley, in the above (so called) "letters of orders," simply styles himself "*a Presbyter* of the Church of England."

2. In that document, he does not say a word about having ordained Dr. Coke to be a Bishop, but merely that he "set him apart† as a *Superintendent*." Now what did Wesley mean, by this phrase of setting him "apart as a Superintendent?"

In the letter, above quoted, addressed (not to Bishop Coke, but) to "*Dr. Coke*,

* Wesley *saw* this when it was too late. Dr. Coke, in his letter to Bishop White, says: "He (Mr. Wesley) being pressed by our friends on this side of the water, for ministers to administer the sacraments to them, (there being very few clergy of the Church of England then in the States,) went farther, I am sure, than *he would have gone*, if he had *foreseen* some events which followed."

† "Ordination is not to be confounded with the *designating* or *setting apart* of a person to the work of the ministry; for in strictness, any one may do this for himself, or it may be done for him by his parents, guardians, &c., and involves nothing but what any *layman* may perform; whereas *ordination* is the actual *communication of authority* from a legitimate source, to execute those functions which appertain to the several orders of the ministry." (Staunton.)

Mr. Asbury, and our Brethren in North America," is the following paragraph, which explains the whole transaction:

"I have *appointed* Dr. Coke and Mr. Francis Asbury to be joint *Superintendents* over our Brethren in North America."

Now, I beg you to examine this language narrowly. 1. Wesley does not say he *ordained* Dr. Coke and Mr. Asbury, but simply that he "*appointed*" them. But, by using the word "appointed," did Wesley mean that he ordained them? Certainly not; because the same word (appointed) is used respecting them both, and Wesley did *not* ordain Asbury, for Asbury was at that time in America, and had been for several years previously. Nevertheless, Wesley "appointed" *him* a Superintendent, as well as Coke; and as ordination was not necessary to constitute *Asbury* a Superintendent, neither was it necessary to constitute *Dr. Coke* one; and it is evident that, as Asbury was not ordained, Coke could not have been, (as the same word, "appointed," is used respecting them both,) and that Wesley did not mean to say that he had ordained them, when he said that he "appointed" them. Indeed, the idea of *ordaining* a Superintendent of a merely *human society*,* is a thing utterly unknown to the Scriptures and the Church of God. It is precisely the same thing, as if a *Presbyter* now was to ordain a Superintendent for the Sunday School Union, or a Bible Society. Wesley was too sound a divine to adopt any such absurd notion. He was himself the Superintendent of the Methodist Society in England, but had never been ordained to that office; and if *Wesley* could be a Superintendent without ordination, the same could be done by Coke or Asbury without ordination. No, sir, there is not a particle of evidence to prove that Wesley ever "ordained" Dr. Coke. Coke was placed precisely on the same footing with Asbury, (who was a *layman*)—Wesley "appointed" them *both* Superintendents of the Methodist Society in North America; and the only difference between them is this: that in "appointing" Dr. Coke, Wesley did it in rather a more formal manner, by placing his hands on his head, and praying over him!

But (2d,) did Wesley by "appointing" Coke and Asbury to be "Superintendents" intend to make them "Bishops?" Lee, in his "Short History," gives the following account of these men first calling themselves *Bishops*, in the minutes of their Conference: (pages 127-8.)

"In the course of this year (1787) Mr. Asbury reprinted the general minutes; but in a *different form* from what they were before. The title of this pamphlet was as follows:

"A form of discipline for the ministers, preachers, and members of the Methodist Episcopal Church in America; considered and *approved* at a Conference held at Baltimore in the State of Maryland, on Monday, the 27th day of December, 1784. * * * *

"In this discipline there were thirty-one sections, and sixty-three questions, with answers to them all.

"The third question in the second section, and the answer, read thus:

"Q. Is there any other business to be done in Conference?

"A. The electing and ordaining of *Bishops*, Elders, and Deacons.

"This was the *first* time that our Superintendents ever gave the title of *Bishops* in the minutes. *They changed the title themselves without the consent of the Conference!*"

Thus it appears that a fraud was practised by one of these Superintendents to

* At that time, there was no such thing in existence as a "Methodist *Church*." Wesley, and the Methodists themselves only spoke of themselves as the Methodist *society*, or societies, or sometimes as the Methodist *Connexion*, and that Wesley was their founder and father. Of course, it was only a *human society*, and nothing more: indeed, at *that* time, it did not claim to be any thing more; and the idea, of *ordaining* a Superintendent, or any other minister, for a human society, is absurd. Lee says, (page 47,) "We were only a religious society, and not a Church." At page 94, he says: "At this Conference we formed ourselves into a regular *Church*." How a religious society could be turned into a *Church*, he does not inform us. This was *after* Coke came to America.

get himself recognized as a Bishop—No less a fraud than *altering* the minutes of the Conference! and this, too, by endeavouring to make it appear to the world, that they had been recognized as *Bishops* by the Conference since the first foundation of "the Methodist Church," in 1784! whereas the Conference had only recognized them as *Superintendents*—the office to which Wesley had appointed them—and this alteration of their title, for this purpose by *themselves*, took place in 1787!

Lee, in his "History," goes on to remark:

"At the next Conference they asked the preachers if the word *Bishop* might stand in the minutes; seeing that it was a Scripture name, and the *meaning* of the *word* Bishop was the same with that of Superintendent."

Observe here, the reason assigned for assuming the title of Bishop. It was not that Wesley had ordained them to that office. Coke knew better than that! But because the *word* "Bishop" *meant* "Superintendent!" So it also means an "overseer," but is every overseer therefore a Bishop? So the word "*Presbyter*" means "an old man;" but is every old man therefore a Presbyter? So the word "Deacon" means "a servant;" but is every servant therefore a Deacon? It is evident from this transaction, that Coke and Asbury did not dare to assign Wesley's "appointment" as the ground for their assuming the title of the chief officer in the Church of God; otherwise they would not have assigned such a school-boy reason for their unjustifiable act.

Lee, in his "History," then goes on further to remark:

"Some of the preachers opposed the alteration, and wished to retain the former title, [that of superintendent;] but a *majority* of the preachers agreed to let the word *Bishop* remain; and, in the annual minutes for the next year, the first question is: 'who are the *Bishops* of our Church for the United States?'"

Thus was consummated one of the most startling frauds of modern times; and the whole "Methodist Church" has ever since, been led to believe, that Wesley ordained Dr. Coke a Bishop, and then "commissioned" him to ordain Asbury a Bishop, and that these two were actually recognized and called *Bishops* by the Methodist Conference since the first foundation of their "Church," in 1784! And, what is more, this fraud is actually perpetrated to the present day; for in the "Book of Discipline," (chap. 1, sec. 1,) it is said expressly: "*Francis Asbury* was solemnly set apart for the said *Episcopal* office by prayer, and the imposition of hands of the said Thomas Coke, other regularly ordained ministers assisting in the sacred ceremony. *At which time*, the General Conference, held in Baltimore, did unanimously receive the said Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury as their Bishops, being fully satisfied of the validity of their Episcopal ordination!"

Now when did this "imposition of hands" on Mr. Asbury by Dr. Coke take place? Mr. Lee informs us, in his "History," (p. 94,) that it took place at the Conference, which began in Baltimore on December 27, 1784; whereas it was not until 1787, that the minutes were altered; and it was not until the "next Conference" afterwards, that the Superintendents were "received" as Bishops! and when the Conference did consent to "receive them as *Bishops*," it was not done "unanimously," but was the act of only a "majority" of the preachers. And thus are the Methodists imposed upon until this very hour!

It is enough to make one shudder, when contemplating the manner in which these men attempted to thrust themselves into the chief office of the Christian ministry. The recollection of it appears to have grievously weighed upon Dr. Coke's conscience, when he afterwards so earnestly wrote to Bishop Seabury to ordain him and Asbury *Bishops!* and to Bishops White and Seabury to ordain their preachers over again! And well it might weigh upon his conscience! The wonder is, it did not drive him into a mad-house! Wesley himself tells us the effect it had upon *him*, when he heard of Asbury claiming to be a Bishop! He tells us it made him *shudder*—and well it might. He thus writes to Asbury:

JOHN WESLEY TO FRANCIS ASBURY.

"*London, September* 20, 1788.

"There is, indeed, a wide difference between the relation wherein you stand to the Americans, and the relation wherein I stand to *all* the Methodists. You

are the elder brother of the American Methodists; I am, under God, the father of the whole family. Therefore, I naturally care for you all, in a manner no other person can do. Therefore, I, in a measure, provide for you all; for the supplies which Dr. Coke provides for you, he could not provide, were it not for me—were it not, that I not only permit him to collect, but support him in so doing.

"But, in one point, my dear brother, I am a little afraid both the Doctor and you differ from me. I study to be *little*, you study to be *great;* I *creep*, you *strut* along; I found a *school*, you a *college*. Nay, and call it after your own names! Oh, beware! Do not seek to be something! Let me be nothing, and Christ be all in all.

"One instance of this, your greatness, has given me great concern. How can you, how *dare* you suffer yourself to be called a *Bishop?*

"I *shudder*, I start at the very thought! Men may call me a *knave*, or a *fool*, a *rascal*, a *scoundrel*, and I am content; but they shall never, by my consent, call me a Bishop! For my sake, for God's sake, for Christ's sake, put a full end to this! Let the Presbyterians do what they please, but let the Methodists know their calling better.

"Thus, my dear Franky, I have told you all that is in my heart; and let this, when I am no more seen, bear witness how sincerely

"I am your affectionate friend and brother,

JOHN WESLEY."*

This letter is a remarkable document. Four years had nearly elapsed since his "appointment" of Dr. Coke. In the mean time Wesley had had time for reflection. He had time for a further and more deliberate investigation of the authority of Presbyters to ordain; and however he might, for a season, have been blinded by the sophistical book of Sir Peter King, so as to suppose Presbyters and Bishops were the *same order*, yet now he gives his more mature judgment, that they were not—for that is the meaning of the last clause in his letter, where he speaks of the Presbyterians. It is well known that the doctrine of the Presbyterians is, that Bishops and Presbyters are the same order; and many of them, even to this day, do not scruple to call themselves Bishops. In reference to *this fact* it is, that Wesley says in the above letter, "*Let the Presbyterians do as they please, but let the Methodists know their calling better.*" That is, let the Presbyterians, if they please, call themselves *Bishops*, but let not the Methodists follow their example—let *them* know their calling better than to call themselves Bishops, when they are not.

Now, let it be remembered, that the question before us is: Did Wesley, when he "appointed" Coke and Asbury "Superintendents" of the Methodist Society, ordain them Bishops?

It is certain he did not. This letter to Asbury, in the very plainest manner possible—words cannot be plainer—declares that Asbury was *no Bishop;* and yet Coke did for Asbury precisely what Wesley did for Coke—he laid his hands upon him, and prayed over him: and if, in Wesley's judgment, this imposition of hands and prayer by a Presbyter did not constitute Asbury a Bishop, neither could they, in Wesley's judgment, have constituted Dr. Coke a Bishop; for Coke's authority to ordain was the same as Wesley's, (which was no authority at all,) both of them being *Presbyters* of the Church of England; and, therefore, it is proved clearly and undeniably, that in appointing Coke and Asbury to be "Superintendents" of the Methodist Society, Wesley did not ordain them Bishops.

Notwithstanding their high-handed assumption of the *title* of Bishop, still these men were uneasy. The fact was still staring them in the face, (and the world knew it,) that Wesley had only "appointed" them to be Superintendents of the Methodist Society UNDER HIM;† and, however they might claim to be Bishops

* From Moore's Life of Wesley, vol. ii. page 285.

† In his letter "appointing" Dr. Coke a Superintendent, Wesley says, "Whereas many of the people in the Southern Provinces of North America, who desire *to continue under my care*," &c. In his letter to Asbury, he says: "The supplies which Dr. Coke provides for you, he could *not* collect, were it not for *me*—were

—and, however they might alter the *name* in the minutes—still Bishops of the Church of God they were not! Something, then, must be done to get around this matter, and convince the people, 1. That Wesley was a Bishop; 2. That Wesley ordained Coke a Bishop; and, 3. That Coke ordained Asbury a Bishop! One would suppose, when Asbury had Wesley's letter, (dated September 20th, 1788,) in his pocket, declaring that *he* was no Bishop, and that *Asbury* was no Bishop, that this would not be a very easy matter to accomplish. But these men did not stick at trifles; they had already fabricated a new set of minutes for their "Church" to get the *title* of Bishops, and they were determined to go all lengths sooner than fail in their project to be accounted *real* Bishops. The Bishops of *the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States* had now for some time been consecrated; Coke and Asbury knew that *their* commission was authentic; that *they* had been consecrated in England and Scotland by *lawful* Bishops; and that the Church had received them as Bishops, in a regular succession from the Apostles. Coke and Asbury knew all this; and alongside of these men, as Methodist "Superintendents" they felt their littleness, although they had assumed the name of what they so much coveted! They knew that they had the *name* of a Bishop, and that was all! They had no succession to point to! Let us see, then, how they proceeded to get the *reality*. At one of their Conferences, held in the year 1789, Mr. Lee, in his "History," informs us (p. 142,) that

"The *Bishops* (that is, Coke and Asbury) introduced a question in the annual minutes, which was as follows:

"*Q. Who are the persons that exercise the Episcopal office in the Methodist Church in Europe and America?*

"A. John Wesley, Thomas Coke, and Francis Asbury, by regular order and SUCCESSION!!

"The next question was asked *differently* from what it ever had been in any of the former minutes, which stands thus:

"Q. Who have been elected by the unanimous suffrages of the General Conference to *superintend* the Methodist Connexion in America?

"A. Thomas Coke and Francis Asbury."

The drift of these questions and answers can be seen at once. Their object is to make it appear, (1.) That it was the *Conference* and not Wesley, which "appointed" them *Superintendents!* and (2.) To make it appear, that Wesley was a Bishop, and ordained them Bishops, and that thus they have a regular *succession* from a lawful *Bishop!* Now, let it be remembered, that these questions were introduced by Coke and Asbury themselves! *They* saw the full drift of them, although the Conference might not have seen it! Calmly and without prejudice review this proceeding; and then, taking it in connection with the *fact*, that they fabricated a new set of minutes to get the *name* of a Bishop, and with the *fact* that Asbury had in his possession Wesley's letter declaring that *he* was no Bishop, and that *Asbury* was no Bishop—I say, calmly and without prejudice review this proceeding, in connection with these *facts*, and then say, whether modern or ancient times afford a more daring or unhallowed scheme, than this presents, of men undertaking to usurp the office and authority of a Christian Bishop!

These facts, also, prove that Coke and Asbury *knew* that Wesley did not ordain them Bishops, when he "appointed" them Superintendents of the Methodist

it not that I not only *permit* him to collect, but *support* him in so doing." The following question and answer were adopted at the Conference in 1784. "Q. 2. What can be done in order to the future union of the Methodists? A. During the life of the Rev. John Wesley, we acknowledge ourselves his sons in the Gospel, ready, in matters belonging to Church Government, to OBEY HIS COMMANDS," &c. (Lee's History, p. 95.) Mr. Lee afterwards observes: "This engagement to *obey* Mr. Wesley's commands, in matters belonging to *Church Government*, was afterwards the cause of some uneasiness." No wonder. Wesley's letter to Asbury when he set up for a *Bishop*, was well calculated to make him *uneasy*

Society *under him.* But, if there be any doubts remaining on this point, they will be removed by the perusal of Dr. Coke's letters to Bishops White* and Seabury† of the Protestant Episcopal Church.

1. It will be observed, in *both* of these letters, that Dr. Coke does not, for a moment, claim to be *a Bishop.*

2. His letter to Bishop White shows, that he exceeded the authority given him by Mr. Wesley, and that Mr. Wesley disapproved of his proceedings.

3. In his letter to Bishop Seabury, he asks Bishop Seabury to ordain him "*a Bishop* of the Methodist Society!" Thereby acknowledging that Wesley, when he "appointed" him a Superintendent, did not ordain him a Bishop, of that society!

4. In his letter to Bishop Seabury, he asks Bishop Seabury to ordain Mr. Asbury *a Bishop* of the Methodist Society; thereby acknowledging that *his* ordination of Asbury to be a Bishop was only a *mock ordination!*

5. In his letter to Bishop Seabury, asking for the admission of the Methodist preachers into the Protestant Episcopal Church, Dr. Coke says, that he "*knows that they must submit to a re-ordination.*" Of course, the ordination they received from *him* was good for nothing, otherwise there would have been no necessity for their being ordained over again.

6. These letters prove, beyond question, that Coke knew and believed, that *Bishops alone* possessed authority to ordain; that no such authority was possessed by *Presbyters* (otherwise *his own* ordinations would have been valid, for *he* was a Presbyter;) and, consequently, that he knew and believed that Presbyters and Bishops were not the *same order.*

7. These letters, too, show conclusively, what was Dr. Coke's opinion of *Wesley's* ordinations (as they are called)—that is, that they possessed *no validity* whatever; and, therefore, that when Wesley "appointed" him a Superintendent of the Methodist Society, he did not "ordain" him a *Bishop* of the Church of God.

C.

The following paragraph is the close of a Letter addressed to me by Dr. Durbin in the public prints, and which, for good reasons, I determined not to notice. The matter referred to is not of much consequence, and I would overlook it entirely, did I not know that some persons have regarded his statement as true; and have naturally drawn conclusions against those principles of the Church with which Dr. Pusey's name is so nobly associated.

"It was deemed desirable by my brethren, that the capital questions in dispute should be distinctly stated, as the general judgment of the Church in England and America is, that Puseyism is Romanism in disguise. The proceedings of the existing Church authorities in England which resulted in the suspension of Dr. Pusey from the ministry, and the resignation of Mr. Newman, are sufficient evidence of their views."

"Evidence"! There is no truth in the statement. No Church authorities have acted in the premises. Dr. Pusey has not been suspended from the ministry; and if it be meant that Mr. Newman has resigned his ministry, (in which case only it would be evidence of his doctrinal unsoundness,) that also is untrue. A person acquainted only with the first principles of Church polity, never could have been guilty of such an assertion, as Dr. Durbin has here hazarded; and that too, in respect of a case which was correctly reported

* Published in Bishop White's Memoirs.

† The letter to Bishop Seabury is similar. The autograph is in the possession of the Rev. Dr. Seabury of New York.

even in the newspapers. He needs to be informed that a clergyman can be suspended from his ministry only by his diocesan. But the Bishop of Oxford has never interfered with Dr. Pusey, even so much as to give him a rebuke. The latter was suspended only from the privilege *of preaching within the precincts of the University, for two years;* and that by the Vice Chancellor, acting in his capacity of supreme civil magistrate of the city and University of Oxford, and without paying any regard to the provision of the statute under which he acted, that the 'offence should be examined in open court.' Dr. Pusey was punished without having any distinct charge brought against him. No one in authority has dared to say, that his famous sermon contained one word contravening any doctrinal statement of the Church of England. Neither the Vice Chancellor, nor his lieutenant, Professor Garbett, have ventured so far as this. The title of the statute under which Dr. Pusey *suffered* (it is wrong to say "punished," for a man cannot be punished, properly speaking, unless he is guilty of an offence,) is "*De offensionis et dissentionis materia in concionibus evitanda;*" i. e. "about avoiding matters of offence and dispute in sermons." Such matters, the statute states, are those which are "contrary to, or at variance with, the publicly received doctrine and discipline of the Church of England;" and the statute closes with these words, "*et praedictorum criminum suspectus pacis reus habeatur,*" i. e. "and one charged with the aforesaid offences may be accused as a *disturber of the peace.*"

Such was the pretended offence. At most, it was a *civil* offence, and illegally punished by a *civil* magistrate, without giving the accused a trial, or a hearing. In a published note, the Vice Chancellor says, "Dr. Pusey has my full authority for saying, that he has had no hearing." Dr. Pusey is still a priest in the Church of England, Canon of Christ Church, and Regius Professor of Hebrew; and is free to preach any where he may be invited, beyond the Vice Chancellor's jurisdiction. It may be as well to state here in addition, that that officer, and those who have acted with him, have lately received a rebuke from the Convocation which has covered them with shame.

Mr. Newman's resignation was simply of the vicarage of St. Mary's. He wished to make it two years before, in order to relieve his persecutors from the sin of indulging their personal animosity against him; but he was dissuaded from it by his Bishop. His meek forbearance, however, did them no good; and he at last, voluntarily, gave up the living of St. Mary's, together with the chapel annexed, which he had founded himself.

THE END.

ERRATA.

Page 28, top line, for *means* read *mean.*

Page 30, 3d line from the bottom, for *justifiable* read *justified.*

Page 33, in the quotation near the bottom, for "The Homily says they taught the doctrine of Sacramental justification;" read, "'The Homily says they taught the doctrine of 'justification by faith alone;' you say they taught the docrine of 'Sacramental justification.'"

Page 34, in the 9th line from the bottom, erase the words "their minds are"—

Page 49, 1st line in 2d quotation, for *has* read *hast.*

Page 52, 6th line from the top, for *redoubteble* read *redoubtable.*